

[COMMITTEE PRINT]

THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY
EDUCATION ACT OF 1965,
AS AMENDED

SELECTED ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY
1965-1973

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES



SEPTEMBER 1973

Printed for the use of the Committee on Education and Labor
CARL D. PERKINS, *Chairman*

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1973

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

CARL D. PERKINS, Kentucky, *Chairman*

FRANK THOMPSON, Jr., New Jersey	ALBERT H. QUILL, Minnesota
JOHN H. DENT, Pennsylvania	JOHN M. ASHBROOK, Ohio
DOMINICK V. DANIELS, New Jersey	ALPHONZO BELL, California
JOHN BRADEMAS, Indiana	JOHN N. ERLÉNBERG, Illinois
JAMES G. O'HARA, Michigan	JOHN R. DELLENBACK, Oregon
AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, California	MARVIN L. ESCH, Michigan
WILLIAM D. FORD, Michigan	EDWIN D. ESHELMAN, Pennsylvania
PATSY T. MINK, Hawaii	WILLIAM A. STEIGER, Wisconsin
LLOYD MEEDS, Washington	EARL F. LANDGREBE, Indiana
PHILIP BURTON, California	ORVAL HANSEN, Idaho
JOSEPH M. GAYDOS, Pennsylvania	EDWIN R. FORSYTHE, New Jersey
WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY, Missouri	JACK F. KEMP, New York
SHIRLEY CHISHOLM, New York	PETER A. PEYSER, New York
MARIO BLAGGI, New York	DAVID TOWELL, Nevada
ELLA T. GRASSO, Connecticut	DONALD A. SARASIN, Connecticut
ROMANO L. MAZZOLI, Kentucky	ROBERT J. HUBER, Michigan
HERMAN BADILLO, New York	
IKE ANDREWS, North Carolina	
WILLIAM LEHMAN, Florida	
JAI ME BENITEZ, Puerto Rico	

PREFACE

Since the 93d Congress is now considering an extension and amendment of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, I thought it would be helpful to the decision-making process to have a reference guide to the most significant books, reports, monographs, articles and recent Committee hearings which have appeared since the Act was signed into law in 1965. Consequently, the Congressional Research Service of the Library of Congress, under the direction of the General Subcommittee on Education, prepared this selected, annotated bibliography on ESEA.

In view of the many thousands of individual project reviews and Statewide reports of ESEA programs which have been published since 1965, this bibliography is of necessity selective. It primarily contains works with a national or regional scope which concern or focus on the entire ESEA or one of its programs. Whenever possible, the annotations in the bibliography have tried to summarize some of the principal findings or recommendations of a study or article.

I wish to express the special appreciation of the Subcommittee to the staff of the Education and Public Welfare Division of the Congressional Research Service, and, in particular, to Mr. David S. Osman for their preparation of this bibliography.

CARL D. PERKINS,
Chairman, General Subcommittee on Education,
Chairman, Committee on Education and Labor.

CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction	1
Section I: ESEA Multititle.....	3
Section II: ESEA title I.....	17
Section III: ESEA title II.....	40
Section IV: ESEA title III.....	53
Section V: ESEA title V.....	60
Section VI: ESEA title VII.....	66
Section VII: ESEA title VIII.....	68
Section VIII: ESEA title IX.....	70

THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1965, AS AMENDED—SELECTED ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY, 1965-73

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this annotated bibliography is to provide a brief description of the primary aims, findings, and recommendations of the *major* books, articles, monographs and government reports which have appeared concerning the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1965, as amended, since its enactment. Considering that the combined total of newspaper stories, periodical articles, books, project reports, and research evaluations regarding ESEA and its programs numbers in the many thousands, this bibliography of necessity is extremely *selective* and *limited*. In general, works are included which have a national or regional scope and which explain, analyse, or evaluate ESEA or its programs, or make recommendations for improvements. With few exceptions, the program reports of individual States or cities, or single project evaluations or studies are not listed. Since 1965, there have been hundreds of such State reports: thousands concerning individual projects. Also, works which chiefly record projects or programs are not included in the bibliography.

This bibliography is organized with separate SECTIONS for all the current titles of ESEA: titles I, II, III, V, VII, VIII, and IX. In addition, the first SECTION of the bibliography is for works discussing all of ESEA and for materials giving equal consideration to two or more titles. Within each SECTION, citations are divided into at least two parts: for selected books, reports, and monographs; and, for selected periodical articles. In addition, when applicable, there is a separate part listing Congressional hearings. Hearings included in this bibliography are for the 91st and 92nd Congress only and are usually cited en bloc. As a result, the majority of hearing citations affecting the ESEA will be found under SECTION I—ESEA MULTITITLE.

SECTION I: ESEA MULTITITLE

There are many books, reports, and articles which concern ESEA in general, two or more of its titles, or which raise questions regarding some aspect of the ESEA rationale or approach. This MULTITITLE SECTION offers a sampling, but only a sampling, from this extensive body of literature. There is no pretense that this section is either comprehensive or totally representative; but rather, this SECTION has the more limited objective of providing a selection of what appear to be *some* of the more significant works or topics of debate regarding more than one title of ESEA.

Two sets of U.S. Office of Education reports cited in this SECTION deserve special comment. The first set, the Commissioner's Annual Reports for FY 1970 and FY 1971, provide some general progress information for a number of the ESEA programs and activities. The second set, the FY 1971 and FY 1972 annual evaluation reports prepared by the OE Office of Planning, Budgeting, and Evaluation provide additional summary information on the purposes, operations, and effectiveness of the various ESEA programs. The Congressional Appropriations Committee hearings for FY 1972 and FY 1973 (also cited in this SECTION) are an additional source for summary evaluative information on ESEA programs.

It should also be noted that the HEW Audit Agency has conducted a number of audits on the uses of funds under various of the ESEA programs. Similar in a number of ways to the format and approach in certain reports by the U.S. General Accounting Office (see SECTION II: ESEA TITLE I), these HEW Audit Agency reports often provide detailed information on the operation and administration of a particular ESEA program within a State. Because of the extremely small number of copies printed of each Audit Agency report and the extensive number of reports for all ESEA programs (in excess of 100), practical use of these Audit Agency reports seems effectively limited to the Audit Agency's own reading room at this time. Because of these limitations and the generally intra-State focus of these reports, they are not cited individually or collectively in this bibliography.

A. SELECTED BOOKS, REPORTS, AND MONOGRAPHS

Bailey, Stephen K., *and* Edith Mosher. ESEA; the Office of Education administers a law. Syracuse, Syracuse University Press [1968] 393 p.

"This is a study in public administration. It is the story of the role of a Federal agency in developing and administering a law. The law—The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (hereafter ESEA)—is an important watershed in the history of American education. It set in motion a series of fiscal, political, and

administrative forces that cannot help but have profound consequences for American education and for the American Federal system generally. Some of these broader implications of ESEA will be examined in the concluding chapters. The body of the study, however, is directed not at the possible or probable long-range consequences of a particular law; it is focused on the administrative behavior of a government agency during a brief period of policy gestation and organizational crisis. The time period is artificially circumscribed. It covers a two-year span—roughly spring, 1964 to spring, 1966.”

Bedenbaugh, Edgar H., and Kern Alexander. Financial equalization among the states from federal aid programs. In Johns, R. L. Kern Alexander and Dewey Stollar. National Educational Finance Project; status and impact of educational finance programs. Gainesville, Florida. National Educational Finance Project, v. 4, 1971. p. 251—291.

A study of ten selected federal aid to education programs, including ESEA Titles I, II, III, and V, in order to determine the extent to which allocations of funds provide for equalization in relation to the relative financial ability of the fifty States to support public education. Utilizing both Spearman and Pearson coefficients, the study examines each program individually and then summarizes the results of the correlations. A significant negative correlation indicates an equalizing effect; a significant positive correlation, a dis-equalizing effect; and no significant correlation, a neutral effect. The study found significant negative correlations at the one percent level for both Spearman and Pearson for ESEA Title I; significant positive correlations for both for ESEA Title II; no significant correlation for either for ESEA Title III; and a significant Spearman negative correlation at the five percent level, but no significant Pearson correlation for ESEA Title V. Among the implications of their study, the authors suggest that categorical grant consolidation or, better still, substantial general aid, better lends itself to ameliorating differences in the relative ability of the States to finance education.

Berke, Joel S., and others. Federal aid to public education: who benefits? Syracuse, Syracuse University Research Corporation [1971] 84 p.

This study is an evaluation of the role that federal funds are playing in the total local-state federal complex of educational finance in five states. The study sought to determine patterns of allocation of aid, i.e. who was benefiting; to examine the decisionmaking process determining those patterns of distribution; and to recommend changes that would assure that federal aid to education goes where it is most needed. Research focused on the allocation of education aid under eight federal programs including ESEA: Titles I, II, and III to 573 school districts in California, Massachusetts, Michigan, New York, and Texas over a four-year period from FY 1965 through FY 1968. Among the major findings were (1) that rural school districts received the most federal aid per pupil; within the metropolitan areas central cities received proportionally more total federal aid than their suburbs, but the amounts received were too

small to make up for suburban advantage in local wealth and state assessment; (2) federal aid provided no important compensating effect for variations in district capacity to support education; (3) due to the impact of ESEA Title I, federal aid was significantly related to educational need although the amount of aid for the disadvantaged was still too meager; (4) over the four-year period of the study, amounts of aid received by individual districts varied markedly and erratically; (5) faulty program administration and design have contributed to the dilution of impact from federal aid programs especially under ESEA Title I; and (6) that in view of the problems confronting public education, the amounts of federal aid are too small. The report gives some special consideration to ESEA Title I (as the largest of the eight programs examined) and indicates that only under Title I did the fifty largest cities in the nation receive funds equal to their percentage of state's student population.

Berke, Joel S., Michael W. Kirst, *and others*. Federal aid to education? who benefits? who governs? Lexington, Massachusetts, Lexington Books [1972] 421 p.

The authors state that this book has three purposes: "first, to chart the patterns of allocation of federal aid to education (i.e., who benefits?), second, to study the decision-making that determined those patterns of distribution (i.e., who governs?), and third, to recommend needed changes in both distribution formulas and in administrative practices." The book consists of nine chapters. The first chapter is the Syracuse University Research Corporation study by Berke and others, "Federal Aid to Public Education: Who Benefits?" cited above. The second chapter discusses the politics and administration of federal programs and describes the research approach used in chapters 3 to 8. Each of those chapters analyzes the politics of federal aid in one of five states, California, Massachusetts, Michigan, New York, and Texas, plus Virginia "... the last added to provide a study of southeastern school politics. Chapter 9 discusses the intergovernmental relations that exist in the implementation of federal aid programs and summarizes major conclusions and recommendations. Included in chapter 9 is a title-by-title analysis of some significant aid programs, among which are ESEA Title I and Title II. Among the conclusions in their summary the authors state:

"A stronger relationship exists between some rough indexes of educational need and federal aid both in the aggregate and in particular regard to Title I. Strong positive correlations between the proportion of non-white pupils and federal assistance were found in our work, and other investigators have found a similar phenomenon regarding the flow of federal aid and the incidence of low achievement scores. In short, Title I in particular, and total amounts of federal aid to a lesser extent, provide more aid to areas with greater proportions of high-need students. Unfortunately, the magnitudes of aid involved are seldom equal to the immense cost of effective education of the poor and culturally deprived."

Five specific recommendations are made:

“1. Federal education policies should emphasize differential administration.

2. The political processes related to the allocation of federal educational resources should be opened up to a wider range of interest representatives and general government officials.

3. Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act should be vastly increased in funding.

4. In addition to the continuation of categorical aid programs aimed at specific national purposes, new federal aid programs should be designed to serve as a lever to change the course of state policy.

5. Federal aid should be addressed to eliminating the wealth- and need-based disparities that characterize state patterns of raising and distributing revenues for education.”

Cohen, David K., Walter J. McCann, Jerome T. Murphy *and* Tylle R. Van Geel. The effects of revenue sharing and block grants on education. Cambridge, Harvard Graduate School of Education [October 31, 1970] 167 p. plus appendix.

This report resulted from the work of a graduate seminar—Education and Public Policy—at Harvard University during the 1969–70 academic year. The report examines the issues surrounding Federal revenue sharing and block grants on education, especially as relates to overall school support, the political and administrative impact, the church-State issue, and Federal nondiscrimination requirements. Chapter 6 provides six pages of summary and conclusions. The final paragraph concludes:

“Fundamentally, then, our difficulty is that revenue sharing and education block grants are remedies for a problem we do not have. The government of the nation’s schools is not marked by federal and state dominance, but rather by their incapacity to effectively respond to problems which elude the control of local school districts. Grant consolidation, and program streamlining can reduce the bureaucratic obstacles to state and local initiative—these are important steps, and long overdue. But solutions to existing school problems, and the resolution of imbalances in the federal system of school government will come only if state and federal school agencies are organized to meet their growing responsibilities. Fiscal decentralization would be a step in the wrong direction.”

Coleman, James S., *and* others. Equality of educational opportunity. Washington, U.S. Govt. Print. Off. [1966] 737 p.

This report was conducted in response to the mandate of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 that the Commissioner of Education “. . . conduct a survey and make a report to the President and the Congress, within two years of the enactment of this title, concerning the lack of availability of equal educational opportunities for individuals by reason of race, color, religion, or national origin in public educational institutions at all levels in the United States . . .”

“Stated in broadest terms, the survey addressed itself to four major questions.

The first is the extent to which the racial and ethnic groups are segregated from one another in the public schools.

The second question is whether the schools offer equal educational opportunities in terms of a number of other criteria which are regarded as good indicators of educational quality. The third major question . . . is how much the students learn as measured by their performance on standardized achievement tests.

Fourth is the attempt to discern possible relationships between students' achievement, on the one hand, and the kinds of schools they attend on the other."

A brief summary of the report and its findings is contained in the first thirty-five pages. Among its major findings was that within regions, school resources available to blacks and whites did not differ significantly; that in most cases, reading and mathematics performance of black students lagged behind that of white students; and that school resources appeared to have little effect upon achievement that was independent of a student's social background. Although the data for this report was gathered prior to the implementation of ESEA, the Coleman findings have had an impact in the deliberation of national educational policy and in discussion on the thrust of ESEA programs, particularly Title I.

Eidenberg, Eugene, and Roy D. Morey. An act of Congress, the legislative process and the making of education policy. New York, W. W. Morton & Co. [1969] 256 p.

"The scope of this book covers the relevant major events preceding the passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, the passage of that act and its subsequent modifications in 1966 and 1967." Part I presents a brief description of the authors' view of how public policy is made and a history of the school aid question prior to 1965 and the 89th Congress. Part 2 presents a case study of the 1965 ESEA. Part 3 ". . . analyzes the reassessment and modification in school aid policies in 1966 and 1967. It also includes a broad view on the policy process."

Jencks, Christopher, and others. Inequality; a reassessment of the effect of family and schooling in America. New York, Basic Books [1972] 399 p.

References: p. 359-381; Index: p. 383-399.

This book summarizes three years of research at the Center for Educational Policy Research at Harvard University. In a review of "Inequality" for the American School Board Journal (December 1972), Lester B. Ball capsulizes the concern and thrust of this work:

Here then—no more and no less out of context than any other one-sentence summary you're likely to read—are Jencks' findings: The quality of education received by K-12 public school children has almost no effect on their future economic success, and spending more money on schools will do almost nothing to close the gap between the rich and the poor.

Chapter 1, "From Equal Opportunity to Equal Results," outlines in more detail the purposes and approach of the book.

"Chapter 2 examines the extent of inequality in the schools, i.e. inequalities in schools' resources, in their social composition, and in students' access to desirable curriculums. It does not, however, assess the consequences of such inequalities. Chapter 3 analyzes the genetic and environmental factors, including schools, that influence scores

on standardized tests. It does not examine the relationship between test scores and adult success. Chapter 4 deals very briefly with the "non-cognitive" outcomes of schooling. Chapter 5 looks at the factors influencing the distribution of educational credentials. But like Chapter 3 it sidesteps the question of how educational credentials are used after they have been acquired. Chapters 6 and 7 investigate the determinants of occupational status and income, including family background, cognitive skills, educational credentials, and school quality. Chapter 8 briefly reviews what we know about job satisfaction, and Chapter 9 draws a variety of conclusions."

McMurrin, Sterling M. (ed.). *The conditions for educational equality*. New York, Committee for Economic Development [1971], 203 p.

This is a compilation of papers on various aspects of the question of educational equality. The papers include: "The Meaning of Equality" by James L. Jarrett; "Poverty and Childhood" by Jerome S. Bruner; "The Crucible of the Urban Classroom" by Staten W. Webster; "Increasing Educational Opportunity: Research Problems and Results" by James S. Coleman; *Relevance and Self-Image in the Urban School* by Larry L. Leslie and Ronald C. Bigelow; and, "The Special Education Problems of the Mexican-Americans" by Clark S. Knowlton.

Mosteller, Frederick, and Daniel P. Moynihan. *On equality of educational opportunity*; papers deriving from the Harvard University faculty seminar on the Coleman report. New York, Vintage Books [1972] 570 p.

In 1969 Daniel Moynihan and Thomas Pettigrew established a faculty seminar at Harvard University to reexamine the original data on which the Coleman findings were based. The seminar engaged in three years of study and one of its results are the essays in this volume. There are fourteen essays altogether: seven grouped under the heading "The Coleman Report", three discussing implications for the future including thoughts about future studies, and four "appendices" examining the problem of measurement. The re-examination tends to confirm many but not all of the findings of the Coleman report.

National Educational Finance Project.

See specific citation under Edgar H. Bedenbaugh.

Planar Corporation. *Incentives in education project evaluation report*; final report. Washington, Planar Corporation. [October 24, 1972] 4 parts; 2 appendices.

"Two incentive models were employed in four medium-sized cities for one year in this project. In Cincinnati, Ohio, and Jacksonville, Florida, incentives of up to \$600 per subject were offered to teachers, (Teacher Only model), depending entirely upon their classroom's performance on standardized Reading and Mathematics achievement tests. In Oakland, California, and San Antonio, Texas, incentives of up to \$600 per subject were offered to teachers and incentives of up to \$50 per subject were offered to parents, (Parent Teacher model) depending entirely upon the classroom's performance on standardized Reading and Mathematics achievement tests. For each classroom a predicted growth rate was calculated in both subjects, and the amount of payment to the parents and teachers depended

upon the degree to which the classroom exceeded the predicted growth rate.

In each city there was one experimental school in which the incentives were offered and a matched control school. All schools in the project were elementary schools, Grades 1-6, with from 500 to 700 students, most of whom were low-income and underachieving. The project began in September, 1971 and ended in May, 1972.

The results that are presented here must be accepted very cautiously by the reader. The project was delayed substantially by contractual problems, so that the teachers and parents did not sign their contracts until the school year was half over. Also, administrative delays prevented a full assessment of student, teacher and parent attitudes.

Single Site Conclusions

In Cincinnati, the offer of incentives to teachers only had a negative impact.

In Jacksonville, the offer of incentives to teachers only had a mixed impact, both positive and negative.

In Oakland, the offer of incentives to parents and teachers had a positive impact.

In San Antonio, the offer of incentives to parents and teachers had a slight positive impact.

Incentive Model Conclusions

The offer of incentives to teachers only had an overall negative impact.

The offer of incentives to parents and teachers had an overall slightly positive impact.

Logistics and Management Conclusions

Single payment formulas, e.g., one year's growth, are going to turn out to be unfair in most cases.

School district data files are unreliable and are not a trustworthy source of primary or secondary evaluation material.

Research projects become a part of the power conflicts and confusions in a school district.

The traditional communications system between homes and schools in a district cannot bear the burdens imposed upon it by innovative projects.

OE is not administratively structured to conduct adequately field projects of this type."

Six specific recommendations are also included in the executive summary.

Perkins, Carl D. School superintendents survey; study of elementary and secondary education programs and needs. Remarks in the House. Congressional Record [daily edition] v. 115, Feb. 6, 1969: H811-H815; Feb. 18, 1969: H996-H1001; March 3, 1969: H1358-H1362; v. 116, Jan. 20, 1970: H62-H80; Jan. 21, 1970: H165-H167; Jan. 22, 1970: H209-H231; Jan. 26, 1970: H251-H296; Jan. 27, 1970: H370-H378; Jan. 30, 1970: H607-H611; Sept. 24, 1970: H9245-H9250; Oct. 8, 1970: H9934-H9940; v. 117, Feb. 18, 1971: H820-H823.

In an effort to determine the impact of Federal aid to education and pinpoint remaining problems and needs at the local level, the House Committee on Education and Labor sent out detailed questionnaires to every school superintendent in the country. Over 8,000 school superintendents responded. Of the possible choices listed, the survey, as reported in the Congressional Record for February 18, 1971, found that the most serious problem facing school districts in 1969-1970 was "inadequate Federal funding" or "late Federal funding". Regarding the most severe operational deficiency, the majority of school districts indicated "inadequate funds for regular programs" with "inadequate facilities and materials" the second most frequent response. In the area of the district's school program most in need of expansion, the most frequently cited was "secondary vocational education" with "preschool education" and "compensatory education" also ranking as high choices. And on the question of what the next step in Federal aid to education should be, "full funding for existing Federal programs" and "Federal aid for construction" were the most frequently chosen followed by "general Federal aid in addition to existing Federal programs" as the second priority. More detailed responses and comments from numerous local school districts are highlighted in the Congressional Record between February 6, 1969 and February 18, 1971.

Riles, Wilson C. (Chairman). The urban education task force report. New York, Praeger [1970] 369 p.

Note: Also included in:

Cohelan, Jeffery. Report on urban education. Remarks in the House.

Congressional Record [daily ed.] v. 116, January 19, 1970: H8-H15; E21-E77.

The commonly termed "Riles" report on urban education. It includes sections on the financial crisis of urban schools, the urban environment of the students, the urban education system, the impoverished urban student. Separate parts on the Federal responsibility and role in urban education and a plan for urban education are also extensively treated.

Suchman, Edward A., *and others*. The relationship between poverty and educational deprivation. [Washington] U.S. Office of Education, Bureau of Research. [August 1968] 1206 p.

The purpose of this study was:

"1. To investigate the relationship between the presence of and exposure to 'poverty' among secondary school students and the development of perceptions, attitudes and values, personality characteristics, and behavior patterns associated with a 'culture of poverty' or cultural disadvantage.

2. To investigate the relationship between poverty and such cultural disadvantage and the different degrees and types of educational deprivation.

3. To investigate the relationship between educational deprivation and future educational aspirations, plans, and expectations.

4. To investigate the relationship of teacher perception, knowledge, attitudes and values, student-interaction, and classroom practices to the problem of educational deprivation.

5. To investigate the relationship between family structure and educational horizons of siblings in poverty families.

"The results of this study are presented in a series of five reports. Each of these reports constitutes a doctoral dissertation dealing with a specific aspect of the study and each, to a large extent, represents a separate, but interrelated, unit of the total study. Each report has been written as a self-contained entity, including its own statement of the problem and hypotheses, description of method, analysis of findings, and conclusions and interpretation. Together, they cover all of the proposed objectives and hypotheses of the project."

The titles of these five reports are:

"Students' Poverty Status and their Educational Horizons"; "Educational Horizons among Lower Class Negro High School Students"; "Adolescents' Perception of School Climate as Related to Selected Personal and School Characteristics"; "The Relationship Between Social Origins of Teachers and Their Attitudes Toward Poverty"; and "The Relationship Between Family Structure and Sibling Achievement".

Syracuse University Research Corporation. Federal aid to public education: who benefits? [Joel S. Berke *and others*]. Syracuse, Syracuse University Research Corporation [1971] 84 p.

Annotated under Joel S. Berke.

U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Office of Education. Annual report of the Commissioner of Education, Fiscal Year 1971. Washington, U.S. Govt. Print. Off., 1972. 163 p.

This is the second annual report of the Commissioner of Education in accordance with the provisions of Section 412(b) of P.L. 91-230. The report consists of nine chapters, seven of which are devoted to what the Office of Education accomplished toward meeting its priorities in FY 1971. Illustrations of accomplishments are drawn from a number of Federal aid to education programs including several from the ESEA.

_____. The Commissioner's annual report . . . March 31, 1971. Washington, U.S. Govt. Print. Off., 1971. 60 p.; appendix.

The first annual report of the Commissioner of Education as required under Section 412(b) of P.L. 91-230. The report deals with the general condition of education in the Nation in FY 1970. In particular, the report highlights some selected noteworthy accomplishments under a number of Federal aid to education programs including several from the ESEA. New directions and the unfinished Federal agenda are also discussed.

_____. *Office of Program Planning and Evaluation*. Annual evaluation report on education programs: FY 1971. Washington, [U.S. Office of Education] January 1972. 295 p.

"Section 404 of the General Educational Provisions Act requires that a report 'evaluating the results and effectiveness of programs and projects assisted' be submitted annually to the appropriate committees of the Congress. In the four years since the Congress legislated this requirement, individual reports on several of the major education programs have been submitted (on Titles I and III of the ESEA, for example), but this is the first time an effort has been made to provide a comprehensive report on all Office of Education programs.

"This first effort is just that. It falls far short of providing, for the approximately 100 OE programs or legislative titles, the kind of rigorous, objective, quantitative, evaluation data which both the executive and legislative branches should have if good funding and management decisions are to be made about these programs. A systematic program for designing and carrying out the kinds of studies which will provide this needed evaluation data has been initiated, but the results are only now beginning to come in. As for the present lack of evaluation results, we must simply note that systematic efforts at evaluating education programs have had only a brief history. In FY 1968 and 1969, for example, only \$1.25 million was appropriated for evaluating over \$4 billion in Office of Education programs; and in prior years even small token amounts were available."

For each program, this first submission provides: (1) a brief report on the status of evaluation, (2) an overview statement on what the available evidence seems to indicate about the effectiveness of the major education programs and expenditures, and (3) a collection of short evaluation reports on each of the educational programs and legislative titles.

Annual evaluation report on education programs: FY 1972. Washington, [U.S. Office of Education] March 1973. 328 p.

This report is an extension of the FY 1971 Annual Report (see the previous citation). It incorporates the findings of approximately 15 evaluative studies completed during the year as well as some additional operational program information. This report covers OE programs *as of June 30, 1972*. Subsequent decisions and program information are not reflected which makes the report somewhat historical in nature.

B. SELECTED PERIODICAL ARTICLES

Guthrie, James W. What the Coleman reanalysis didn't tell us. *Saturday Review*, v. 55, July 22, 1972: 45.

The author provides a critique of the data upon which the 1966 Coleman report and the 1972 Moynihan reanalysis were based (see above, Part A for citations for these two works). Guthrie finds:

"The methodological, conceptual, and practical problems that the Coleman researchers encountered in arriving at their 'no-school effect' conclusion have been documented many times. The wrong kinds of tests were administered and in the wrong ways. School 'effectiveness' was too narrowly defined. The sample was biased and the data unreliable.

"Given the nature of these flaws, there exists no legitimate way to reanalyze the data and validate the original findings. The only way in which the original Coleman findings could be proven is by collecting new information through a new survey or set of surveys that eliminate the flaws of the first. This the Harvard seminar participants did not do. For the most part, they had to satisfy themselves with running the same 'dirty data' through their computers. Even so, some of these 'reruns' resulted in findings contrary to the original report."

Halperin, Samuel. ESEA: five years later. *In* Remarks of Lloyd Meeds. Congressional Record [daily edition], v. 116, September 9, 1970: H8492-H8494.

The article is a review with the perspective of 1970 of the circumstances and expectations influencing ESEA as it came into being in 1965. The motivations and problems affecting each of the original titles are recalled as well as "the context of expectations in which ESEA was born."

Hodgson, Godfrey. Do schools make a difference? *Atlantic*, v. 231, March, 1973: 35-46.

A comparative discussion of the findings, implications, and controversies surrounding the educational research of James Coleman, Daniel Moynihan, Christopher Jencks, Thomas Pettigrew, Arthur Jensen, David Armor and others.

How much can we boost IQ and scholastic achievement? a discussion. *Harvard educational review*, v. 39, Spring, 1969: 273-356.

A discussion of the Arthur Jensen article and conclusions of the same title (*Harvard Educational Review*, Winter, 1969; citation below). The discussion includes essays by Jerome S. Kagan, J. McVicker Hunt, James F. Crow, Carl Bereiter, David Elkind, Lee J. Cronbach, and William F. Brazziel.

The participants in this discussion range from those in disagreement with both Jensen's evidence and logic to those essentially concurring with the re-emphasis on heredity but disagreeing with his conclusions.

Jennings, John F. Federal general aid—likely or illusory? *Journal of law and education*, v. 2, January 1973: 89-126.

This article explores several of the principal factors which will be involved in the Congressional consideration of the issue of Federal general aid during the 93rd Congress. Six principal factors "... which will greatly influence the legislative consideration ..." are discussed: civil rights, private schoolchildren, Federal control of education, equalization, safeguards for categorical programs, and a revenue source.

The ESEA as well as other Federal education legislation is related to the topic of general aid throughout the article.

Jensen, Arthur R. How much can we boost IQ and scholastic achievement? *Harvard educational review*, v. 39, Winter, 1969: 1-123.

Jensen argues that compensatory education has been tried, that it has failed, and that the premises on which these compensatory efforts have been based should be reexamined. Jensen questions the central notion that IQ differences are almost exclusively the result of environmental differences and the cultural bias of IQ tests. Arguing that environmental factors are not nearly as important in determining IQ as genetic differences, Jensen analyzes the environmental influences that may be most critical in determining IQ. He concludes that educational attempts to boost IQ have been misdirected and that the educational process ought to focus on teaching more specific skills. This can be accomplished most effectively if educational methods are developed which are based on other mental abilities besides IQ.

Kirp, David L. Revenue sharing and its effect on the poor. *Clearing-house review*, v. 5, January, 1972: 496-497, 520-582.

The author discusses the Administration's special revenue sharing proposals of the 92nd Congress focusing on their possible impacts on the poor. Special attention is given to the example of education revenue sharing. The author contends, in part, that existing abuses of Federal aid programs to improve the education of the poor—such as under ESEA Title I—would get even worse under a revenue sharing program with only minimal administrative requirements. The author argues that the Federal presence is necessary in a well-conceived plan to reform education, and that “. . . it is incorrect to assert . . . that Federal education programs have not worked; in fact, they have never been fully tried.”

Milstein, Mike M. The Federal impact on state education agency planning. *Planning and changing*, v. 2, April, 1971: 31-38.

The article discusses some of the initial uses, problems, and prospects of funds from the various ESEA titles to State education agencies.

“There has been an enormous impact of Federal dollars on SEAs during the 1960s. Whereas before 1958, Federal programs were basically limited to vocational education programs which did not affect the broader SEA administrative structures, by 1969 Federal funds accounted for 41 percent of all SEA expenditures and covered the spectrum of educational activities. Federal input appears to have leveled off at this time, but the activities required to operationalize the programs initiated in the past decade have caused major administrative disruptions in SEAs.

There are many things that SEAs can do to achieve their own objectives with federally funded programs. To do so, they must first work to identify these objectives and then plan to make the most effective use of Federal resources.”

C. SELECTED CONGRESSIONAL HEARINGS (91ST AND 92ND CONGRESS)

U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Appropriations. Departments of Labor-HEW, Appropriations for FY 1973. Hearings before a Subcommittee. 92nd Cong., 2nd sess., Part 2—Office of Education; Special Institutions. Washington, U.S. Govt. Print. Off., 1972. 1291 p.

Contains program accomplishments and other information and discussion for the various programs under the ESEA and other Federal education legislation.

———. *Office of Education and Related Agencies Appropriations for 1972. Hearings before a subcommittee. 92nd Cong., 1st sess., Part 1, Washington, U.S. Govt. Print. Off., 1971. 1716 p.*

Contains program accomplishments and other information and discussion for the various programs under the ESEA and other Federal education legislation.

U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Education and Labor. Extension of elementary and secondary education programs. Hearings. 91st Cong., 1st sess., on H.R. 514. Parts 1-4. Washington, U.S. Govt. Print. Off., 1969. 2986 p.

Hearings held in Washington, D.C.,

Part 1—January 15 . . . February 5, 1969;

Part 2—February 6 . . . February 25, 1969;

Part 3—February 26 . . . March 4, 1969;

Part 4—March 5 . . . 10, 1969.

Hearings on a bill to extend programs of assistance for elementary and secondary education and for other purposes.

———. Oversight hearings on elementary and secondary education programs. Hearings, 91st Cong., 2d sess., on H.R. 17861. Washington, U.S. Govt. Print. Off., 1971. 993 p.

Hearings held in Washington, D.C., May 13 . . . July 15, 1970; Los Angeles, Calif., May 23, 1970.

Hearings on a bill to extend the authorization of programs under ESEA through FY 1978. The hearings consist primarily of testimony and evidence from school administrators, teachers, and other interested parties.

———. Oversight hearing on elementary and secondary education. Hearings, 92d Cong., 1st sess., on H.R. 7796. Washington, U.S. Govt. Print. Off., 1972. 55 p.

Hearing held in Washington, D.C., December 9, 1971.

The hearing concerns a special education revenue sharing bill which would consolidate many of the existing ESEA programs.

———. Oversight hearing on elementary and secondary education. Hearing, 92d Cong., 2d sess., on H.R. 44, H.R. 981, H.R. 1491, H.R. 6179, H.R. 7796, H.R. 12695 and related proposals. Washington, U.S. Govt. Print. Off., 1972. 4 parts.

Hearings held in Minneapolis, Minn., January 11, 1972; in Lexington, Ky., January 13 and 14, 1972; in Washington, D.C., February 23, 1972; and in Washington, D.C., September 26, 27, 28 and October 4 and 11, 1972.

These hearings were concerned with the present operation of Federal programs supporting elementary and secondary education, especially ESEA, and the future direction of Federal support for elementary and secondary education. The hearings consist primarily of testimony and evidence from school administrators, teachers, and other interested parties.

U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Appropriations. Labor-HEW Appropriations. FY 1973. Hearings before a subcommittee. 92nd Cong., 2nd sess., on H.R. 15417. Part 1. Washington, U.S. Govt. Print. Off., 1972. 1302 p.

Contains program accomplishments, discussion, and other information on the various programs under the ESEA and other Federal education legislation.

———. Office of Education, special institutions, and related agencies appropriations; FY 1972. Hearings before a subcommittee. 92nd Cong., 1st sess., on H.R. 7016. Part 2. Washington, U.S. Govt. Print. Off., 1971. pp. 735-2146.

Contains program accomplishments, discussion, and other information on the various programs under the ESEA and other Federal education legislation.

U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Subcommittee on Education. Education Revenue Sharing Act of 1971. Hearings, 92d Cong., 1st sess., on S. 1669. Washington, U.S. Govt. Print. Off., 1971. 271 p.

Hearings on October 27, 28, and November 3, 1971.

The hearings concerned a special education revenue sharing proposal which would consolidate many of the existing ESEA programs.

_____. *Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1969. Hearings, 91st Cong., 1st sess. on S. 2218 [and] H.R. 514. 2 Parts. Washington, U.S. Govt. Print. Off., 1969. 1298 p.*

Hearings held June 11 . . . July 18, 1969.

These hearings concern two proposals to extend the programs of ESEA and for other purposes.

U.S. Congress. Senate. *Select Committee on Equal Educational Opportunity. Equal educational opportunity—1971. Hearings, 92d. Cong., 1st sess., Washington, U.S. Govt. Print. Off., 1971, pp. 5509–5841.*

Part 12—Compensatory education and other alternatives in urban schools.

Hearings held in Washington, D.C., July 14, 15, and August 3, 1971.

The hearings consist of testimony regarding the achievements and accomplishments of Federal aid to education programs in large urban areas. There is considerable testimony regarding ESEA programs, especially Title I.

SECTION II: ESEA TITLE I—FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES FOR THE EDUCA- TION OF CHILDREN FROM LOW-INCOME FAMILIES

Three separate Parts of the Title I legislation authorize programs of formula grant assistance. *Part A* authorizes a program of basic grants to local educational agencies to provide special educational services to educationally disadvantaged children. In addition, *Part A* also authorizes payments to State Educational Agencies for special educational services for migrant children, for such handicapped and neglected and delinquent children for which the State agency has a special responsibility, and for State administrative purposes. *Part B* authorizes a program of special incentive grants to States whose non-Federal public education expenditures exceed the national average. *Part C* authorizes a program of special grants for urban and rural school districts serving areas with the highest concentrations of children from low-income families.

Since the ESEA was signed into law (P.L. 89-10) in 1965, Title I has been the largest single avenue of Federal categorical assistance to elementary and secondary education. With an appropriation of \$1.597 billion in FY 1972, the Title I basic grant (*Part A*) programs served an estimated 7.35 million children in 14,200 local school districts plus nearly 400 thousand additional children through the State agencies.

As the largest elementary and secondary education assistance program, and because of its purpose to meet the special educational needs of educationally disadvantaged children, Title I has been an object of particular concern and scrutiny since its inception. No other title of ESEA has had as much publicity or as many local, State, and national reports and evaluations. Nor has any other title seemed to have stirred as much discussion and controversy concerning its implementation, its management, but most of all, its achievements. SECTION II attempts to provide a guide to some of the more significant literature which specifically focuses on Title I; however, certain of the monographs, articles, and hearings cited in SECTION I: ESEA MULTITITLE also have portions relevant to the Title I program and might be consulted.

A. SELECTED BOOKS, REPORTS, MONOGRAPHS

American Institutes for Research in the Behavioral Sciences. ESEA Title I: a reanalysis and synthesis of evaluation data from fiscal year 1965 through 1970. [By Michael J. Wango and others] Palo Alto, California [March, 1972] 276 p.

This study evaluates the operation and impact of ESEA Title I since its inception on the basis of reanalysis and synthesis of existing evaluation data derived primarily from local, State, and na-

tional evaluation studies. Title I's operational context was reviewed and needs were identified; then management performance, resource allocation, and impact on participating children were evaluated. Primary findings, conclusions, and recommendations are summarized in the first twelve pages.

Among its conclusions, the study contends that national-level data indicate that (a) most States and many LEA's have failed to implement their programs in full compliance with existing regulations, guidelines, and program criteria; (b) funds and services have been under-allocated for academic programs, over-allocated for supportive (non-academic) services, and misallocated to children without critical needs for compensatory services; and (c) there is little evidence at the national level that the program has had any positive impact on eligible and participating children. The summary contains twelve specific recommendations concerning administration and evaluation, eight recommendations concerning resource allocation, and eight recommendations regarding the impact on children. Appendix B lists 41 successful compensatory education projects with explanatory notes and definitions.

American Institutes for Research in the Behavioral Sciences. Further examination of exemplary programs for educating disadvantaged children; final report. [Michael J. Wango, P. L. Campeau, and G. K. Tallmadge] Palo Alto, California [1971] 294 p.

This study was the third in a series, and its primary objective was the identification and description of successful compensatory educational programs for disadvantaged children. Programs were considered successful if they demonstrated cognitive benefits that were statistically and educationally significant. The second objective of this study was to determine the state-of-the-art in noncognitive benefit assessment based on a review of affective and social benefit evaluations of successful programs. After many evaluation reports were reviewed and site visits made, several programs were identified as successful and were then subject to closer analysis. The study concludes that very few compensatory education programs have clearly demonstrated success. The study notes that improvements must be made in program evaluation before the effectiveness of such programs can be fairly assessed. Descriptions and analyses of some successful programs are included.¹ (ERIC).

American Institutes for Research in the Behavioral Sciences. Foundations for success in educating disadvantaged children; final report. [David G. Hawkrigde, G. K. Tallmadge, and J. K. Larsen] Palo Alto, California [December 1968] 112 p.

The aim of this study was to identify those characteristics of compensatory education programs most likely to be associated with success and failure respectively in producing measured benefits of cognitive achievement. Eighteen well-designed, successful programs were compared with 25 matching, unsuccessful programs. Successful and unsuccessful programs were selected from an earlier study of over 1,000 projects. Tallies of 91 program components were prepared. Each successful program was then compared with one or two matching unsuccessful programs. The component composition of these programs was analyzed both qualitatively and quantitatively.

Resulting recommendations for establishing sound programs were, for preschool programs: (a) careful planning, including statement of objectives; (b) teacher training in the methods of the programs; (c) instruction and materials closely relevant to the objectives—for elementary programs: (a) academic objectives clearly stated; (b) active parental involvement, particularly as motivators; (c) individual attention for pupils' learning problems; (d) high intensity of treatment—for secondary programs: (a) academic objectives clearly stated; (b) individualization of instruction; (c) directly relevant instruction.¹ (ERIC)

American Institutes for Research in the Behavioral Sciences. A study of further exemplary programs for the education of disadvantaged children; final report. [David G. Hawkrigde, A. B. Chalupsky and A. O. H. Roberts] Palo Alto, California [June 1969] 181 p.

The principal aims of this study were to identify, select, analyze, and describe educational programs for culturally disadvantaged children from preschool through grade 12 which had yielded measured benefits of cognitive achievement. A literature search and mail inquiries followed by telephone consultations constituted the identification and selection process for the programs. Sixteen programs finally selected (situated in twelve urban areas in eight states) were visited on site, and as a result, five programs were eliminated. This report contains the descriptions of the remaining eleven programs, all meeting the criteria that no program was included unless data available indicated that pupils in the program had achieved statistically significant greater gains on standardized tests than had controls, or had improved at a rate better than national norms. Programs described were mostly inner-city projects for black children, but two served mainly Mexican-Americans; descriptions relate to the nature, operation, and results of each program. The report also includes detailed descriptions of the methods and procedures employed in the study.¹ (ERIC)

American Institutes for Research in the Behavioral Sciences. A study of selected exemplary programs for the education of disadvantaged children; final report. [David G. Hawkrigde, A. B. Chalupsky and A. O. H. Roberts] Palo Alto, California [September 1968] 2 parts.

The principal aims of the study were to identify, select, analyze and describe compensatory education programs which had yielded measured benefits of cognitive achievement. Identification and selection were accomplished through a literature search and the advice of a panel of experts. Site visits to 98 programs in 31 urban areas assisted in further selection and provided data for analysis. Twenty-one programs were designated as exemplary; in each, pupils had achieved statistically significant better scores on standardized tests than had controls, or than national normative figures.

Part I of the report describes the study and provides an analysis of the components of the twenty-one selected exemplary programs. With the conclusions are suggested guidelines for program design and evaluation and possible approaches to cost-effectiveness analysis for compensatory education programs. Part II of the report de-

¹ (ERIC) Description primarily from ERIC Research in Education published by U.S. Office of Education.

scribes each of the twenty-one selected, successful programs in enough detail hopefully to permit school districts to make preliminary decisions concerning local replication. Most of the programs selected were inner-city projects serving minority students. Anderson, Myron L. A financial analysis of Title I, Public Law 89-10, and the formation of a defensible federal financial aid distribution plan. *In* National Committee on Education Finance. Interdependence in school finance: the city, the state, the nation. Washington, National Education Association [1968] p. 192-195.

Proceedings of the 11th National Conference on School Finance, March 31, April 1 and 2, 1968, Dallas, Texas.

A brief report of a study on ESEA Title I investigating the effectiveness of Title I fund allocation to the States for financial assistance to public schools in low-income areas. The study examined data from the 50 States, eight income regions, and 423 Indian school districts. Among eight specific conclusions were the following:

"(1) There was a relatively high inverse relationship between state and regional Title I per-pupil allotments and state and regional personal income per child of school age (5-17). The correlation coefficients, -.6433 and -.6387, indicated a substantial negative relationship. (2) There was a low inverse relationship between local school corporation Title I per-pupil allotments and local school corporation adjusted assessed valuation per pupil in ADA. The correlation coefficient, -.1111, exhibited a low negative relationship."

Based on his findings and conclusions, Anderson recommended the distribution of Title I ESEA funds at the local level in a manner which would reflect an inverse relationship between Title I ESEA money and the adjusted valuation of property in the local school district.

Averch, Harvey A. *and others*. Section VI: evaluation of broad educational intervention. *In their* How effective is schooling? a critical review and synthesis of research findings. Santa Monica, The Rand Corporation [1972]. p. 100-125. (Prepared for the President's Commission on School Finance)

Annotated under The Rand Corporation.

Berkin, David, *and* Walter Hettich. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act: a distributional analysis. St. Louis, Institute for Urban and Regional Studies, Washington University [1968] 32 p.

The study analyzes the interstate distribution of ESEA Title I funds using two different criteria: horizontal equity—people who have the same resources and financial position are treated in the same manner, and vertical equity—the way in which people with different resources and financial position are treated. Regarding the horizontal aspect, results showed that when compared with an alternative—the Orshansky index—the present official need index provided a satisfactory measure of the disadvantaged school population. Regarding the vertical analysis, consideration of net transfers and gross aid led to the conclusion that the degree of redistribution of wealth among the States under Title I was very small. During the period of this analysis, the ESEA Title I allocation formula consisted of the number of eligible children times half the State

average per-pupil expenditure. Among their conclusions the authors considered Title I "a conservative measure when judging by distributional standards," which "... breaks little ground in equalizing the states' ability to provide education."

Burke, Arvid J., James A. Kelly and Walter I. Garms. Educational programs for the culturally deprived; need and cost differentials. [National Educational Finance Project, Special study no. 3] Albany, New York, School of Education, State University of New York at Albany [1970] 3 parts in one volume.

Annotated under National Educational Finance Project.

Glass, Gene V., and others. Data analysis of the 1968-69 survey of compensatory education (Title I). Boulder, Colorado, University of Colorado, Laboratory of Educational Research [August 1970] 194 p.

For the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education.

This report presents the results of analysis of data from ESEA Title I program evaluations collected in the 1969 Survey of Compensatory Education. These data analyses bear on the evaluation of the operations and impact of the programs in 9,236 school districts and 3,219 elementary schools, involving 215,995 teachers of 5,773,976 pupils in grades two, four, and six. The data analyses are organized around four general questions about compensatory education programs in Title I elementary schools during the 1968-69 school year.

(1) In what context of families, schools, and communities were compensatory education programs conducted? The report summary lists 12 separate findings concerning this question, including that of nearly 12 million Title I pupils in grades 1-6, approximately 50 percent attended rural schools; that approximately one-quarter of Title I elementary pupils came from families in which per-family-member income was less than \$800; other ethnic and economic characteristics; that proportionally more teachers with less than three years experience were teaching in Title I classrooms; and that most teachers in the survey had not received any formal training in teaching the educationally disadvantaged.

(2) What was the extent of needs for compensatory education programs and how did these needs vary with such factors as pupil's ethnic-group membership, urbanism of school, etc.? Six specific findings were listed, including that the greatest incidence of academic need was for compensatory reading; that there was a relationship between the need for compensatory education and ethnic group membership, income of family, urbanism, ethnic group concentration in the classroom, ethnic membership of teacher, kindergarten attendance, and welfare; and that the incidence of critical needs for compensatory programs was not related to the age of the school building, rate of school absenteeism, or mobility of the student population.

(3) How efficient and sensible was the process of allocation of resources for compensatory education programs? Were Title I funds and participation in compensatory education programs allocated to the schools, teachers and pupils with the greatest need? Seventeen

findings on this question included that high-expenditure school districts tended to receive more funds per poor child than medium or low expenditure districts, that pupils with the greater need for compensatory education tended to participate in compensatory programs, and that greater use of reading instruction in subgroups or with individual pupils was the principal difference between disadvantaged and regular academic programs.

(4) What impact did compensatory education programs have? Four specific findings were listed, including that participants in reading programs for the disadvantaged had lower pretest and post-test scores. In addition, the researchers found that teachers' ratings of pupils' growth in basic skills tended to be higher than available data from standardized testing.

Gordon, Edmund W., and James Kourtrelakos. Utilizing available information from compensatory education and surveys; final report. New York, Teaching and Learning Research Corp. [June 1971] 196 p.

The absence of systematic analyses and syntheses of data from hundreds of documents relating to compensatory education is given as justification for a study unifying and evaluating already available information. Section One of this document introduces the need for such a study and discusses problems and procedures used in conducting and interpreting compensatory education evaluation research. Section Two delineates the status of compensatory education and Title I programs by citing major findings and conclusions from previous efforts, by representing findings graphically on a matrix and by summarizing major studies according to the following categories: academic skills, early childhood programs, affective development, parent and community involvement, staff training, overhaul of schools and school systems. Section Three elaborates on implications for evaluation research by considering exemplary studies of compensatory education, by analyzing survey and national assessment strategies and by proposing some answers to questions about the purpose, design, interpretation and policy determination for evaluation research. Abstracts of relevant literature and numerous programs plus a list of references are interspersed within the text.¹ (ERIC)

Haberman, Martin. Compensatory education for the culturally deprived; the wrong language for the right problem. Tallahassee, Florida, Southeastern Interstate Project [1972].

A "state of the art" paper commissioned by the Southeastern Interstate Project finds that compensatory programs are designed to perpetuate the traditional school, keep non-deprived groups from revolting, and give the Federal Government an opportunity to support public education while preserving "the traditional function of local control for as long as possible." The paper is based on the study and review of available literature on compensatory education including the Westinghouse studies of Headstart and the Office of Education evaluations of ESEA Title I programs.

¹ (ERIC) Description primarily from ERIC Research published by U.S. Office of Education.

Hawkrige, David G., G. K. Tallmadge and J. K. Larsen. Foundations for success in educating disadvantaged children; final report. Palo Alto, California, American Institutes for Research in the Behavioral Sciences. [December, 1968] 112 p.

Annotated under American Institutes for Research in the Behavioral Sciences.

Hawkrige, David G., A. B. Chalupsky and A. O. H. Roberts. A study of further exemplary programs for the education of disadvantaged children; final report. Palo Alto, California, American Institutes for Research in the Behavioral Sciences [June, 1969] 181 p.

Annotated under American Institutes for Research in the Behavioral Sciences.

———. A study of selected exemplary programs for the education of disadvantaged children; final report. Palo Alto, California, American Institutes for Research in the Behavioral Sciences [September, 1968]. 2 parts.

Annotated under American Institutes for Research in the Behavioral Sciences.

Hayman, John L., Jr., and others. Critical problems of evaluation in the great city schools: diagnoses, analysis, suggested new directions. Chicago, American Educational Research Association [April 1972] 97 p.

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association.

A study conducted of Title I evaluation practices in urban districts which comprised the membership of the Council of the Great City Schools. The study identifies special problems related to Title I evaluation, and makes recommendations for improving evaluation practices. The report contains sections regarding the evaluation of Title I projects—problems and needs; a summary of on-site visits—procedure and results; a summary of questionnaire results; a summary of conference results; and appendices.

Hughes, John F. and Anne O. Hughes. Equal education; a new national strategy. Bloomington, Indiana, Indiana University Press [1972] 243 p.

This book is a study of the ESEA Title I program. The book is divided into two parts, “. . . the first of which (chapters 2-7) includes an examination of the national educational experience with special reference to the convergence within Title I of both the opportunity strategy and the limited education strategy of the 1960's. In this examination, attention is specifically directed at those legislative and administrative policies and politics which provide the foundation for the design of a new strategy for education. Chapter 2 deals with the legislative politics of the Elementary and Secondary Act (ESEA), and chapters 3-5 respectively analyze the internal political structures of the federal, state, and local levels of education and how they interacted with each other in the implementation of the strategies of the sixties. In chapter 6 the emergence of the clients as a force in behalf of their own educational advancement and their acquisition of the tactics of advocacy is analyzed. And in chapter 7 a summary of the experience with the prior strategies and

an extrapolation of the foundations for a new and full-fledged strategy for education are presented.

In Part Two (chapters 8-10), the design of the proposed national strategy for education is set forth, including its likelihood for gaining political acceptance. Chapter 8 describes the rationale of the proposed educational mandate for the strategy, as well as the formula for funding the educational needs of all of the clients to be served. Chapter 9 describes the key tactics of the strategy at each administrative level in education. And chapter 10 examines the political and administrative requirements essential to the fulfillment of the proposed strategy."

Kiesling, Herbert J. Input and output in California compensatory education projects. Santa Monica, The Rand Corporation [October 1971] 57 p.

Annotated under The Rand Corporation.

The Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights under Law. Title I Comparability: a preliminary evaluation; a report prepared by The Lawyers Committee . . . school finance project. Washington [September, 1972] 29 p; 6 appendices.

This report examines eighty selected school districts to determine how they have complied with the comparability requirements [20 U.S.C. 241e(a) (3) (C)] added to ESEA Title I by P.L. 91-230 and with the regulations published in the Federal Register on October 14, 1971. Of the districts examined, the report found the overwhelming number had taken no action to comply with comparability requirements, and few had plans to do so in the future. "Of the eighty school systems studied, seventy-nine (or 98.75%) had one or more non-comparable schools. One fourth of these districts lacked comparability in 80% or more of their Title I schools." Only one district had a perfect record of comparability. The report notes that its findings are in sharp contrast to a letter from OE Commissioner Sidney Marland which stated that approximately 80% of local educational agency reports showed '*prima facie*' comparability. The report closes with twelve specific recommendations for the Office of Education, and State and local educational agencies regarding comparability compliance.

McDill, Edward L., Mary S. McDill and J. Timothy Sprehe. Strategies for success in compensatory education; an appraisal of evaluation research. Baltimore, Johns Hopkins Press [1969] 83 p.

Study by three sociologists which addresses three problems affecting compensatory education: (1) the quality of evaluation research, (2) the effectiveness of existing programs to date, and (3) future planning of programs and research to test performance. Research findings of ESEA Title I, Headstart, Upward Bound, and eleven selected local programs are described and reviewed. The final section of the book focuses on strategies for success. In suggesting the elements of successful compensatory education programs, the authors seem to rely particularly on the findings of two studies: "Foundations for Success in Educating Disadvantaged Children" by D. G. Hawkrigde, G. K. Tallmadge, and J. K. Larsen, and "Evaluation of 'Successful' Projects in Compensatory Education" by J. Posner. Among these identified elements are careful planning and clear

statement of objectives, small groups and a high degree of individualized instruction, relevant instruction and materials linked to program objectives, concentrated treatment, and teacher training in the methods of the program. Three lines of action are encouraged for future compensatory fund allocation: a small group of "control" programs designed to make maximum use of statistical evaluation techniques to best answer methodological questions; a small group of purely speculative, high risk, novel programs; and the large majority of programs with some elements of both of the previous two.

Michigan Department of Education. *Research, Evaluation, and Assessment Services. Program Evaluation Unit*. Fiscal year 1972 evaluation report of programs funded under P.L. 89-10, Title I in Michigan. Lansing, Michigan [December 7, 1972] 21 p., appendix.

"The evaluation of Michigan's Title I programs was comprised of two parts: (1) description of program participants, and (2) analysis of basic skills achievement. The description of program participants was based upon numbers of parents, other lay citizens, students, and staff participants. The activities which parents and other lay citizens were most heavily involved in were planning and evaluation. Most of the students served by Title I were in grades K-6. For both head count and full time equivalence, the Title I program staffs were comprised primarily of professional teachers and paraprofessionals in an approximately equal number. Through the summarization and analysis of basic skills achievement information obtained from LEA Title I evaluation reports, it was found that:

(1) Michigan Title I students, in general, did make educationally significant gains in basic skills achievement. The lowest level of gain was 1.3 months per each month of programming, found in regular school year reading and mathematics reports.

(2) Students receiving small group and tutorial types of instruction tended to make greater gains in basic skills achievement than students receiving remedial or combination types of instruction. However, students receiving a combination type of instruction made greater gains in basic skills achievement than did students in remedial type programs.

(3) As was found for FY 1971 programs, there was no differences in basic skills achievement by grade level."

This evaluation concluded that:

(1) Michigan's Title I programs were successful in raising overall student basic skills achievement; however, there were students who made little or no gain in basic skills;

(2) Michigan's Title I programs should reanalyze their delivery systems so as to identify means by which the achievement of those students who made little or no gain can be improved; and

(3) The Michigan Department of Education should identify exemplary Title I programs for use as improvement models.

Mosbaek, E. J. and others. Analysis of compensatory education in five school districts. [TEMPO, General Electric Company] Washington, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Office of Education, Bureau of Research [1968] 2 v.

Annotated under TEMPO.

NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Inc. Title I for Indian children; chapter III. *In its An even chance; a report on federal funds for Indian children in public school districts.* New York [1971]: 27-40; 59-64.

School districts in eight States enrolling Indian students were studied. The researchers found that Indian students in these districts were not receiving the special assistance Congress meant to provide. "Where Indian children attend school, Title I is spent on the wrong children, in the wrong schools, on programs which are not supplemental and which do not meet the special needs of Indian children." Three quarters of the Title I applications reviewed indicated that Title I was being used as general aid. "In the best of these districts, Indians receive no more and no less than other school districts. In the worst of these districts . . . Indians do not benefit at all from Title I." Recommendations include increased parent participation in Title I, insistence by State education agencies that Indian children get their fair share, stronger enforcement of Title I regulations by the Office of Education, establishment of a special panel in OE to draw up special policies and recommendations for the use of Title I funds for Indian children, and Congressional oversight hearings to determine whether the Office of Education and the Bureau of Indian Affairs are administering Title I in a manner which best serves the educational needs of Indian children.

National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children. *America's educationally neglected: a progress report on compensatory education: the 1973 annual report to the President and the Congress.* [Washington. Draft Copy. 1973] 78 p., Appendices. pp. 79-245.

The Advisory Council's 1973 annual report includes sections on the case for compensatory education, evaluation of compensatory education, comparability, Title I audits, parent involvement, bilingual-bicultural education, migrant education, participation of children enrolled in private schools, the effective use of funds plus 18 legislative and 38 administrative recommendations.

Among the findings in the section on the evaluation of compensatory education are the following:

"Compensatory education programs are locally designed and it is impossible for national evaluations to have impact on local programs. Compensatory education programs are State approved with Federal regulations.

When the local evaluation is compared with a national evaluation, more successful programs are evident. Local data based on pre- and post-tests readily show cognitive gains (objective). Teachers and parents reflect affective gains (subjective).

There has been considerable controversy over the impact of title I expenditures because of the lack of concrete evaluation materials to prove its effectiveness. However, even though many studies have painted a negative view of compensatory education, the studies have often been narrow in scope and deficient due to lack of concrete evaluative data upon which to base the findings.

Major national evaluations all tend to have one common flaw—the criteria applied to the programs do not attempt to achieve the

goals by which the programs were measured. Consequently, gross evaluations of compensatory education tend to be disappointing. Contractors utilized by the Office of Education have been comparing sporadic data collected from various school districts across the country. It is virtually impossible to have a meaningful national evaluation when the data are invalid.

If the present method of securing data is continued, national evaluations will continue to be disappointing. Compensatory education is not a national curriculum. A nationwide prescription was not mandated with the legislation, and there is no common ground for discussing successes and failures on a national level. Uniform goals and uniform priorities do not exist on a national level. What works best in one district might not work well in another.

The design of compensatory education funded by Federal dollars should maximize, as does title I, local initiatives. The Federal role should lead by setting priorities, but it should not mandate a curriculum.

The National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children feels that the cognitive domain should be emphasized, but compensatory education programs should not exclude the affective domain. Studies show that there are large numbers of good compensatory education programs that have been overlooked because evaluators ignored the opinion and judgments of the teachers, parents, and educators.

Within the limits of time and staff, the Council, using broader criteria than that established by narrow national evaluators, has located 216 programs that local and State officials researched and submitted as successful projects."

Appendix B (p. 105-232) contains summary information on these 216 successful projects.

National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children. Annual report—January 31, 1968. Washington [January 31, 1968] 49 p.

The Advisory Council's third annual report on ESEA Title I finds significant progress in helping millions of children overcome serious educational disadvantages, but the report also cites the need for improvement in a number of areas, including greater concentration of Title I resources on fewer children, greater parental involvement, more programs involving conceptual thinking, and more use of concrete, sensory-motor materials with young children. The Council also urges combining desegregation and compensation efforts to improve schools and notes the value of teacher involvement in project decision-making.

National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children. Educating the disadvantaged child; where we stand; the 1972 annual report to the President and the Congress. Washington, U.S. Govt. Print. Off., 1972. 39 p.

This eighth annual report of the Advisory Council presents a commentary on the previous year's administration of the programs for disadvantaged children with recommendations for the future. The report notes that 1.5 million fewer disadvantaged children are now being served due to the concentration guideline directing spending

on fewer for maximum impact; at the same time it is known that the number of children living in school attendance areas with high concentrations of children from low income families is about 20 million—suggesting that about two-thirds needing Title I services are not receiving them. Recommendations in the report relate to State funds for compensatory education, Title I audits and enforcement, delivery of services, legislative proposals for State Advisory Council for Title I, parent involvement, desegregation, nonpublic school children, follow through programs proposed by the Division of Compensatory Education, migrant programs, neglected and delinquent children in State institutions, the Right to Read Program, and teacher training. In light of appeals by private school administrators and practitioners, a special section of the report is devoted to the special needs of private schools serving disadvantaged children.¹ (ERIC)

National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children. First report of the National Advisory Council . . . *In U.S. President, 1963-1969 (Johnson)*. Message from the President . . . Washington, U.S. Govt. Print. Off., 1966, 14 p. (89th Congress, 2nd session. House. Document no. 437)

Message dated May 9, 1966.

The report includes a discussion of projects, problem areas, evaluation, and recommendations. The report notes that while the majority of sampled projects contain little new to the total American educational experience, they are often new to the school systems implementing them and totally new to the disadvantaged children involved. Recommendations include continued focused Federal educational assistance on the disadvantaged, and the needs: for more in-service training for Title I teachers, for implementing special classes for teachers of the disadvantaged at higher education institutions, for establishing more helpful guidelines for local project applicants, for increasing the Office of Education Title I administrative staff, for emphasizing education of preschool children ages 3 to 5, for greater teacher and citizen participation in project planning, and for improved teacher compensation in summer school compensatory programs.

National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children. Title I—ESEA: a review and a forward look—1969: fourth annual report. Washington, U.S. Govt. Print. Off., 1969. 70 p. appendices.

The main focus of this review is on the problem areas the Advisory Council has identified since its first report in 1966 which still remain matters for concern and attention. Major recommendations include:

(1) Office of Education (OE) should make a special effort to disseminate examples of demonstrably successful compensatory education programs, such as the selection of 21 successful projects described in a special supplement in this report;

(2) OE should designate a single visibly placed official to monitor all aspects of Title I participation by nonpublic school children;

¹ (ERIC) Description primarily from ERIC Research in Education published by U.S. Office of Education.

(3) OE should show state and local personnel the full range of possibilities in using Title I funds for health services;

(4) ESEA Title I should be continued substantially as now written;

(5) the principle of concentrating funds where most needed should be adhered to;

(6) the new Administration is urged to offer imaginative leadership in school desegregation and to refuse to back down on this commitment; and

(7) the Executive and Legislative branches should move quickly to close the gap between the Title I appropriation and the authorization of a sum of \$2.7 billion. Two appendices provide examples of successful and "unsuccessful" Title I programs and community case studies of nonpublic school participation.¹ (ERIC).

National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children. Title I, ESEA—the weakest link: the children of the poor; the 1971 annual report to the President and the Congress. Washington, U.S. Govt. Print. Off., 1971 45 p.

Major concerns and recommendations of the Advisory Council's annual report on Title I program: focus on parental involvement and accountability, school finance, state discretion and delivery of services, quality compensatory and integrated education, and cultural differences. There are five appendices, one of which is a comparative study chart of Title I evaluations completed since 1969. National Committee on the Education of Migrant Children. Wednesday's children: a report on programs funded under the migrant amendment to Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. New York, [1971] 132 p.

This report presents the findings and recommendations growing from a one-year national study of the status of education for the children of migratory farm workers. The report specifically focuses on projects financed under the special migrant education provisions of ESEA Title I. Using as principal sources of information the Migrant Programs Branch of the Office of Education, State education agencies, local project questionnaires, and site visits, the following specific areas were monitored and reported on: (1) national program planning, (2) allocation of Federal migrant education funds to the States, (3) expenditures of these migrant education funds within the States, (4) participation of migrant children, (5) staffing, (6) educational planning, and implementation, (7) educationally related services, and (8) participation of migrant parents. In their preface, the authors note that this is not an optimistic report. Twenty-six specific findings are summarized in the concluding section. A general conclusion is that immediate changes to the existing migrant provisions of ESEA Title I are required to guarantee that migrant children receive the services which they need. The report then outlines nine specific recommendations concerning legislation and administration, seven concerning staffing, six regarding educational planning, four concerning educationally related services, and five specific recommendations concerning home-school-community relations.

¹ (ERIC) Description primarily from ERIC Research in Education published by U.S. Office of Education.

National Educational Finance Project. Educational programs for the culturally deprived; need and cost differentials (Special study no. 3). [Arvid J. Burke, James A. Kelly and Walter I. Garms] Albany, New York, School of Education, State University of New York at Albany [1970] 3 parts in one volume.

These studies of compensatory education need and cost differentials were designed to provide identification and quantification of education need variables which must be considered in providing equal educational opportunity, with emphasis on programs for culturally deprived children. "Part A" contains the plan and background for the study. "Part B" contains a study of the target population to be served by compensatory education (means of estimation and actual estimates). "Part C" describes the inputs for selected compensatory education programs and estimates of the cost differentials of such programs relative to the cost of regular school programs. Appendixes contain data-gathering forms and program descriptions.¹ (ERIC)

NATIONAL EDUCATIONAL FINANCE PROJECT

See also specific ESEA Title I citations under Donald Van Fleet; John F. Wagner.

Nuccio, Vincent C., and John J. Walsh. A national level evaluation of the impact of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 on the participation of non-public school children; phase I final report. Chestnut Hill, Mass. [1967] 292 p.

Submitted to the Commissioner of Education under the provision of P.L. 89-10.

This study focuses on non-public school pupil participation in the ESEA I program in FY 1966. The study is based on thirty case studies of large, medium, and small school systems. The study found a general lack of communication between public and non-public school administrators, which worked to the detriment of improved education for some disadvantaged children. State agency officials did not establish formal procedures for involving non-public school superintendents in planning. In most local school districts, administrators were seen to focus only on programs applying to public school children, assuming that these programs would be equally suitable to the needs of non-public children. The report also found that the parochial school hierarchy plus an inadequate knowledge of the Title I legislation hindered effective cooperation. The report concludes:

The operation of Title I during its first year was inevitably characterized by misunderstanding, inefficiency, and uncertainty. Its most valuable service during FY '66 was perhaps to indicate the barriers to effective communication and cooperation between the public and private schools of the nation which must be hurdled if the full promise of ESEA is to be realized. The impact of Title I on non-public schools during the period with which this study is concerned was largely in terms of identifying and isolating problems, internal and external, which need attention. To have achieved that is to have done much.

¹ (ERIC) Description primarily from ERIC Research in Education published by U.S. Office of Education.

Posher, J. Evaluation of successful projects in compensatory education. Washington, U.S. Office of Education, Office of Planning and Evaluation [April, 1968] (occasional paper no. 8).

Annotated under U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, Office of Planning and Evaluation.

The Rand Corporation. Input and output in California compensatory education projects. [Herbert J. Kiesling] Santa Monica [October, 1971] 57 p.

This report describes a study of the relationship of instructional process and program organization to pupils' learning in Title I compensatory education projects, as measured by the Stanford Reading Test. Personnel in 42 projects in 37 California school districts were interviewed to obtain detailed data on teaching strategies, individual instruction time per pupil, intensity of instruction, patterns of coordination of project personnel, and other variables. Variables were related to pupils' monthly gain in grade equivalents via multi-regression techniques, holding program length and beginning score constant. Results contradict reports that compensatory education is ineffective. Individual instruction by trained reading specialists was consistently related to gains. Less strongly related were staff planning time and individual instruction by classroom aides. The six best projects averaged at least 1.25 months' learning per month of instruction. None were large or urban, all had small group instruction by specialists, high ratio of managers to pupils, and planning coordination. In its analysis the study applied economic input-output methodology to compensatory education.¹ (ERIC).

The Rand Corporation. Section VI: evaluation of broad educational intervention. *In its* How effective is schooling? a critical review and synthesis of research findings. [Harvey A. Averch and others] Santa Monica [1972]: pp. 100-125. (Prepared for the President's Commission on School Finance).

The objective of the total work was to assess the current state of knowledge regarding the determinants of educational effectiveness through a critical survey of educational research. The authors identify and analyze five basic approaches used in educational research: the input-output, the process, the organizational, the evaluation, and the experimental. Section VI summarizes a selection of evaluation results and attempts to analyze the effectiveness of broader educational interventions, primarily under ESEA, Title I. Section VI is subdivided into units on the findings from large-scale evaluations, findings from small-scale evaluations, interventions designed basically for research, longitudinal analysis, program characteristics associated with success, the cost of compensatory education, and a summary of findings. In the summary the authors conclude (1) that most large surveys of national compensatory education programs have shown no beneficial results on the average, although the evaluation reports on which surveys are based are often poor and research design suspect, (2) some smaller surveys tend to show short-run positive effects of compensatory education programs (3) a number of more highly structured intervention programs have displayed short-

¹ (ERIC) Description primarily from ERIC Research in Education published by U.S. Office of Education.

term cognitive gains, (4) there is considerable evidence that many short-term gains fade out after two or three years if they are not reinforced, and (5) it would appear that incremental per-pupil costs of successful intervention vary anywhere from \$200 on up, with the feasible range falling between \$250 and \$350; however, since numerous interventions have failed at this level, the level of funding is not itself considered a sufficient condition for success.

TEMPO (General Electric Company). Analysis of compensatory education in five school districts. [E. J. Mosbaek and others] Washington, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Office of Education. Bureau of Research [1968] 2 v.

Volume I of this report summarizes the results of two research studies done by TEMPO under HEW contracts: "A Survey and Preliminary Cost-Benefit Analysis in Elementary and Secondary Education," and "Analyses of Compensatory Education within Schools from Five Major School Districts." Results of compensatory education were evaluated in five school districts distributed across the country. These five districts represented a subsample of an earlier evaluation involving eleven districts. Characteristics of compensatory education activities, reading attainment, and the characteristics of 6,500 pupils in 60 Title I schools were analyzed. The analysis found that Title I funds significantly increased the amount of compensatory education in all five districts, appearing to result in significant improvement in the reading achievement level for some pupils. However, the study found that the degree of success among compensatory activities, even within the same district, appeared to vary widely, with results in one district indicating a decrease in pupil achievement among the lowest 10 percent of the pupils in Title I schools in 1966-67. The study also found a tendency among local school officials to concentrate a small percentage of Title I funds on a small number of children while allocating majority of funding among "... such a large number of pupils that in most cases the funds amount to less than \$5 per pupil."

Volume II provides detailed case studies of each of the five school districts. The description and analysis of each district included: a description of the district and sample school; types of compensatory activities; allocation of compensatory funds; analysis of trends; distinguishing features of successful compensatory programs and characteristics associated with success.

TEMPO (General Electric Company). Survey and analyses of results from Title I funding for compensatory education: final report. Washington. Office of Education [March 1, 1968] 227 p.

The aim of the study was to provide the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare with evidence as to the productivity of compensatory education programs for disadvantaged children, particularly the effects of ESEA Title I during its first year and a half. Data were collected on pupil performance and exposure to compensatory education in 11 school districts (132 schools); in addition to achievement test scores for 1965-66 and 1966-67, information was gathered on the characteristics of the pupils, their schools, and their communities. Results indicated:

(1) a slight decline in average pupil achievement level in the sample schools;

(2) a slight improvement in achievement of pupils at the lowest achievement levels in their respective grades; and

(8) considerable variation in changes in achievement among school districts.

Preliminary results suggested that the amount of improvement was related to level of Title I expenditures. The overall study provided evidence that more specific studies were needed to properly evaluate the effects of Title I.

Urban Institute. Title I evaluation and technical assistance: assessment and prospects. [Joseph S. Wholey *and others*] Washington, D.C. [February, 1971] 151 p.

This report is the result of a seven-month Urban Institute analysis of ESEA Title I evaluation and technical assistance problems and prospects. The focus of the study was on improvement of Federal and State evaluation and technical assistance related to education of disadvantaged children. During the study, site visits were made to five representative State Departments of Education. Chapter 1 is an overview of the major findings, conclusions, and recommendations of this report. The next three chapters are concerned with evaluation of education programs for disadvantaged children. Chapter 2 is a discussion of Federal Title I evaluation: priorities, present status, next steps. Chapter 3 focuses on State evaluation, and Chapter 4, on local evaluation. Chapter 5 examines the implication of existing methodology for evaluation of the Title I program and discusses requirements for further instrument development. Chapter 6 provides an overview of technical assistance from programs for disadvantaged children; Chapter 7, Federal technical assistance; Chapter 8, State technical assistance efforts; and, Chapter 9, the local role in technical assistance to education programs for disadvantaged children.¹ (ERIC).

U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. Effect of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and its administration. In Southern school desegregation 1966-67. Washington [July 1967] (chapter 10): pp. 130-140.

The chapter states that in general ESEA Title I funds have been employed in such a manner so as to institutionalize and strengthen the segregated dual school system. Use of Title I funds to greatly improve all-Negro school equipment and materials, construction or improvement of segregated facilities, and loss of Title I aid when Negro disadvantaged children transferred to white majority schools were among the evidence cited to support the Commission's conclusion.

U.S. Department of Commerce. National Bureau of Standards. Institute of Applied Technology. Technical Analysis Division. The process of funds allocation under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965: an interim report. [Elsie Clark, *and others*] Washington [March 1972] 3 parts with appendices; separate summary: 11 p.

This is an interim report on the study of the allocation of Title I funds required under P.L. 91-230. The scope of this study has three facets:

¹ (ERIC) Description primarily from ERIC Research in Education published by U.S. Office of Education.

(1) identification, description, and evaluation of the allocation mechanisms and procedures used for the distribution of Title I monies from the national levels to the local level;

(2) review of the implementation of Title I and its administration as it related to funds distribution; and

(3) consideration of alternatives to existing processes and procedures that might be recommended to improve existing approaches and resolve present problems.

Due to unavailability of fourth count data from the 1970 Census at the time of this report, the study is incomplete, especially regarding the third facet. However, this report does provide a "substantial response" to some important questions. Concerning the effectiveness of Title I in making funds available to State and local educational agencies within counties, the report states that "the primary distribution to the States and counties on behalf of their LEA's is made by the Office of Education, of necessity using data which are non-uniform and outdated . . . Next, each State educational agency has some latitude in using a sub-county allocation method it deems appropriate. Finally, the LEA's also have areas of choice in selecting schools, establishing programs, and assigning children to them. . . . In addition . . . still another factor has a major impact on the question of effective distribution of funds. This is the fact that Title I has been repeatedly underfunded by the Federal Government." Concerning the appropriateness of the Federal percentage and low-income factor in the formula, the report notes the difficulty in discerning the effects of the Federal percentage, when it is combined with the average per-pupil expenditure for each State with a floor of the national average. "Perhaps even more so, however, the combination of underfunding, and the practical difficulties in exactly distributing Title I funds to the target population, make the effect of the Federal percentage obscure. For in fact, it can be shown that an additional expenditure of 50% for compensatory education is in truth the case for only a small part of the identified target population." Finally, the report considers the effectiveness of the Part B—Special Incentive Grants finding that this program has not offered an effective fiscal incentive to achieve its purpose of increasing State and local efforts for education. The three most important reasons for this conclusion are:

"(1) The formula benefits only about half the states, regardless of the number making an effort to respond.

(2) Those states entitled to the greatest rewards, according to the formula, have no incentive to increase their efforts, due to the ceiling placed on payments.

(3) The actual size of the benefit has been so small, compared to the fiscal effort required by a state, that it could not have constituted an incentive to increase state and local efforts for education."

A future report is to provide a more detailed and critical sub-county study using 1970 Census data as well as make a more detailed study of the part C—Special Grants for Urban and Rural Schools. U.S. Department of Commerce. National Bureau of Standards. Institute of Applied Technology. Technical Analysis Division. The

process of funds allocation under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965; second interim report. [Elsie Clark and others] Washington [March, 1973] 112 p. plus 8 appendices.

This study examines the provisions of ESEA Title I that determine the size and distribution of Title I grants to States and local educational agencies. Section 102 of P.L. 91-230 called for "a study of the allocation of sums appropriated for the purposes of Title I . . . and of the effectiveness of the various provisions of such title in making funds available to State and local educational agencies . . ."

This second interim report complements the first interim report of March 1972 (see preceding citation) by considering alternatives to the existing Title I allocation processes and procedures that might improve these existing approaches and resolve present problems. This second interim report provides an evaluation of the present Title I formula plus numerous charts concerning alternative allocation formulas and their effects. Appendix A concerns Part C of Title I; Appendix B, enumeration updating; and Appendix C, State allotments based on alternative formulas.

U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Office of the Assistant Secretary for Program Coordination. Human investment programs; elementary and secondary education; program analysis. (Prepared by Herbert J. Kiesling) Washington [September 1966] 61 p.

This report represents a survey of analysis and evaluation studies of compensatory educational activities, focused on applicability of the findings for evaluation of ESEA Title I. It does not present results of Title I project evaluations. According to the authors, adequate data for analyzing the actual benefits achieved by Title I projects were lacking in the summer of 1966 when this paper was prepared.

U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Office of Education. Education of the disadvantaged; an evaluation report on Title I Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965; fiscal year 1968. Washington, U.S. Govt. Print. Off., April 1970, 268 p.

This is the third annual report on Title I submitted to the Congress by the Commissioner of Education, but the first such annual report prepared and presented in response to the 1967 ESEA amendments requiring a national evaluation of Title I and its results. It is claimed that while earlier annual reports relied on scattered data from State and local sources, this report rests on data which are generally representative of the Nation's public elementary and, in some cases, of secondary schools as well. The major data source on which the report rests, the 1968 Survey on Compensatory Education, consists of a nationally representative sample of 3,822 public elementary schools operating Title I programs in 465 school districts of 300 children or more. Among its findings, the study estimates that there may be as many as 16.8 million school-age children (aged 5-17) who may be regarded as educationally deprived (more than twice the number of such children served by Title I in FY 1968). Other evidence is seen as supporting the selection by Con-

gress of the public school district as the main vehicle for reaching disadvantaged youngsters. The study also concludes that the special problems in providing special services for the disadvantaged seem more complex than many school districts can handle effectively, and that the Title I formula, which gives proportionally more funds to States spending more per pupil, provides less Title I funding per pupil to those who need it most. Recommendations include permitting local districts to "package" all compensatory funds from all sources thereby concentrating the compensatory effort; providing greater per-pupil financial support where needs are greater, less where they are less; providing funds to school districts to acquire special management assistance and to improve project design, implementation, and evaluation; and giving "greater financial assistance to school districts in cities and rural areas which have both the highest concentrations of educationally disadvantaged pupils and the least financial ability to meet . . . [their] . . . needs."

U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. *Office of Education. Office of Planning and Evaluation*. The effectiveness of compensatory education; summary and review of evidence. Washington [1972] 207 p.

This review sought to gather and analyze all the evaluations of compensatory education efforts in reading and mathematics which included pre-treatment and post-treatment standardized test data. The evidence examined may be divided into two categories: large-scale evaluations which include considerable numbers of children from a wide variety of settings—notably, national, State and city evaluations of programs under ESEA Title I; and situational evidence which is limited to specific projects, schools or smaller research studies. No single set of findings in themselves were judged sufficiently conclusive or representative for policymakers; rather a pattern emerged based on the overall consideration of the evidence. The review found ". . . the drift of evidence seems to be unmistakable; that compensatory education often enhances the achievement of poor children." Concerning the evidence against the effectiveness of compensatory education, the review noted, "the evidence indicating that compensatory education has not worked is, we judge, sobering but not overwhelming, a counsel of caution but not of despair." Success or non-success of compensatory efforts appeared to depend on whether compensatory funds were channeled into traditional patterns of expenditure—salary increases, routine techniques, etc.—or whether they have been used to develop supplementary, focused, compensatory education efforts. Concerning the question of cost-effectiveness of compensatory programs, the evidence was less clear, but the review suggested that an effective compensatory education program requires approximately \$300 per pupil in additional resources. The review underscored the need for more longitudinal studies on the effects of compensatory programs on individual students over long periods of time as well as the need for better cost-effectiveness studies. The major part of the review is made up of twenty appendices, which summarize the various state reports, city evaluations, and other large and small scale evaluations analyzed.

U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Office of Education, Office of Planning and Education. Evaluation of successful projects in compensatory education. [J. Posner] Washington [April, 1968] (occasional paper no. 8)

Fifteen successful compensatory education programs were investigated in an attempt to identify the features that made for success. Three criteria were used in selecting programs: (a) quality of research design and evidence of objective results persisting over a period of time; (b) objectives differing from those of those of other programs selected; and (c) accessibility of programs for site visits. Some recommendations of the study are: (a) objectives should be clearly defined and systematic procedures and implementation time schedules should be established; (b) instruction should be individualized by various means such as one-to-one relationships between teachers and students, tutorial sessions, and computer-assisted instruction; and (c) funds should be allocated at all levels—preschool, elementary, and secondary—and not just concentrated at the preschool level.¹ (ERIC).

U.S. General Accounting Office. The Federal program of aid to educationally deprived children in Illinois can be strengthened: report to Congress by the Comptroller General . . . Washington [June 22, 1972] 68 p.

This report concerns GAO's review of the operation of the ESEA Title I FY 1970 program and certain aspects of the 1971 program of the Illinois State educational agency and the Chicago, Harrisburg, and Rockford local educational agencies. Under the Title I program, the three local educational agencies implemented projects that provided new or additional services which otherwise might not have been available, or which would have been available only on a limited basis, to educationally disadvantaged children. The report found, however, problems in program operation and administration requiring special attention by management officials. Among problems cited were that the local educational agencies failed to establish measurable objectives or adopt specific procedures to evaluate the success of major Title I activities; failed to identify or assess the variety, incidence, or severity of the needs of the educationally disadvantaged children; and did not make concerted efforts to involve parents of Title I children or interested community organizations. Recommendations and suggestions to improve the Title I program were made to HEW, and the State and local educational agencies. Agency recommendations made to HEW were those concerning the need to evaluate project impact, the need to improve determination of eligible school attendance areas, the need for comprehensive assessment of educational needs, the need for improvements in programs design and operation, the need for review of equipment purchased with Title I funds, the need for improvements in State education agency administration of Title I, and the need to consolidate program guidance material.

U.S. General Accounting Office. Improved administration needed in New Jersey for the Federal program of aid to educationally de-

¹ (ERIC) Description primarily from ERIC Research in Education published by U.S. Office of Education.

prived children; report to the Congress by the Comptroller General . . . Washington [April 7, 1971] 55 p.

This report covers a review of the operation of the Title I program in New Jersey, where about \$23 million in Federal money was received each fiscal year between 1966 through 1970. Local review efforts were concentrated in Camden. The report found that a substantial part of the Camden Title I program was providing general aid to public and private school systems, rather than aid to educationally disadvantaged children, that school attendance areas were not selected according to proper procedures, and that some Title I projects were designed to make up for general deficiencies in the school system. Improved procedures for administering the Title I program by the State education agency in 1970 were noted with approval. Among its recommendations, GAO suggested that the Secretary of HEW should:

- (1) review the Camden projects that appear inconsistent with the legislative purpose of Title I and make fund recoveries or adjustments where warranted,

- (2) emphasize to the New Jersey State educational agency the need to ensure that local agencies select and concentrate program aid in properly designated areas, and the importance of designing and operating projects serving the identified needs of educationally disadvantaged children, and

- (3) emphasize to all State educational agencies that Title I funds are not available for general educational needs and that local agencies' project applications and activities must be properly reviewed and evaluation reports used to improve program effectiveness.

U.S. General Accounting Office. Improvement needed in administration of the Federal program of aid to educationally deprived children in Ohio; report to the Congress by the Comptroller General . . . Washington [December 28, 1970] 45 p.

The General Accounting Office reviewed the manner in which the Office of Education was administering its responsibilities under the Title I program in the State of Ohio. According to reports submitted by the State Department of Education, many children received various educational benefits resulting in improved oral and written communications ability during the first four years of the Title I program. Based on its findings, GAO stated its belief that the Office of Education should pay particular attention to the way in which local educational agencies are procuring and using Title I equipment. Among its recommendations, GAO suggested that the Secretary of HEW should:

- (1) emphasize to the Ohio State educational agency the importance of ensuring that Title I projects are conducted in accordance with approved project applications and in a manner which will result in the greatest benefit to educationally disadvantaged children; and

- (2) emphasize to all State educational agencies that, where non-Title I funds are required to implement a Title I project involving major facilities, arrangements have been made to obtain the additional funding to ensure timely implementation of the project.

U.S. General Accounting Office. Opportunities for improving administration of Federal program of aid to educationally deprived children in West Virginia; report to the Congress by the Comptroller General . . . Washington [March 5, 1970] 41 p.

The General Accounting Office reviewed the manner in which the Office of Education was administering its responsibilities under the Title I program in the State of West Virginia. Program evaluation reports for the first three years of the program submitted by the State Department of Education showed children receiving various educational benefits with a marked improvement in school attendance. Although the GAO indicated they did not attempt an overall evaluation of the administration and effectiveness of the State's Title I effort, certain areas for administrative improvement were discussed: school attendance areas were not selected for program participation in accordance with Office of Education criteria; salaries at some local agencies were charged to the Title I project, but duties were not limited to the project; and use of Title I constructed facilities and purchased equipment in the regular school program. Among its recommendations, GAO suggested that the Secretary of HEW:

- (1) take measures to assure proper selection of school attendance areas for Title I participation,

- (2) provide for the clarification of criteria for the proration of salaries, and,

- (3) provide for the Office of Education and the HEW Audit Agency to meet with West Virginia State officials to resolve problems hindering audit coverage of Title I projects in the State.

Van Fleet, Donald S., and Gerald Boardman. The relationship between revenue allocations and educational need as reflected by achievement test scores. In Johns, Roe L., Kern Alexander, and Dewey Stollar. National Educational Finance Project; status and impact of educational finance programs. Gainesville, Florida, National Educational Finance Project, v. 4, 1971: 293-317.

This chapter is a summary of a University of Florida doctoral dissertation by Donald van Fleet which sought to determine the extent to which revenues from Federal, State, and local sources were reaching culturally different or culturally disadvantaged children. The summary focuses on ESEA Title I. The authors' overall finding was that, in all eight States examined, Title I funds were far more effective in reaching low achievers than local or State revenues. The authors state six specific conclusions concerning educational disparities and equalization.

Wagner, John F., and Dewey Stollar. Intent and effect of Title I ESEA in the financial equalization of public elementary and secondary education. In Johns, Roe L., Kern Alexander and Dewey Stollar. National Educational Finance Project, v. 4, 1971: 319-336.

The purpose of this study was to examine the legislative intent of Title I and analyze the effect of Title I in the equalization of funds for public elementary and secondary education among nine selected States. The study concludes that Title I was intended to benefit a target population—educationally disadvantaged children—and was not formulated primarily as a means of equalizing funds for public

elementary and secondary education. Among his conclusions concerning the equalizing effect of Title I among counties within the nine selected States, the author finds:

(1) Title I allocations did not have a disequalizing effect upon available resources;

(2) Title I allocations had a tendency to equalize resources for public elementary and secondary education among the counties within most of the nine States;

(3) Title I had more of an equalizing tendency when using effective buying income criteria than when using adjusted assessed valuation of property as a measure of school financing ability; and

(4) neither the Title I allocation per child in enrollment nor allocations per school age child variables revealed different findings when analyzing the equalizing effect.

Wango, Michael J., *and others*. ESEA Title I: a reanalysis and synthesis of evaluation data from fiscal year 1965 through 1970. Palo Alto, California, American Institutes for Research in the Behavioral Sciences [March 1972] 276 p.

Annotated under American Institutes for Research in the Behavioral Sciences.

Wango, Michael J., P. L. Campeau, *and* G. K. Tallmadge. Further examination of exemplary programs for educating disadvantaged children; final report. Palo Alto, California, American Institutes for Research in the Behavioral Sciences [1971] 294 p.

Annotated under American Institutes for Research in the Behavioral Sciences.

Washington Research Project and NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Inc. Title I of ESEA; is it helping poor children. Revised 2d ed. Washington [1969] 73 p.

This study examines what has happened to ESEA Title I during its first four years: it is not an evaluation of compensatory programs, but a report on how Title I money has been spent and how the program has been administered at the local, State, and Federal levels. The study is based on information from Federal officials, government documents and reports, and from interviews with Title I officials in nine States, Title I coordinators in 28 local districts, as well as numerous principals, teachers, and parents.

The authors find that among school systems across the country Title I:

(1) has not reached eligible children in many instances;

(2) has not been concentrated on the most needy so that there is reasonable promise of success;

(3) has purchased hardware at the expense of instructional programs;

(4) has not been used to meet the most serious educational needs of school children; and

(5) has not sufficiently involved parents and communities in carrying out Title I projects.

In addition, many Title I projects were judged as poorly planned and executed while in some school districts Title I funds were found being used in place of general operating revenue, to supplant other Federal program funds, or to improve racially segregated schools.

The report also concluded that State educational agencies had not lived up to their legal responsibilities to administer the program in conformity with the law and Congressional intent and that the Office of Education ". . . is reluctant and timid in its administration of Title I and abdicates to the States its responsibility for enforcing the law." There are thirteen specific recommendations ten of which are directed toward HEW or the Congress. Among the latter recommendations were that oversight hearings on the use of Title I funds be conducted by an appropriate Congressional Committee, that the Title I community participation provisions be maintained and strengthened, that Title I be fully funded, and that all efforts to make Title I a "bloc grant" be rejected.

Wholey, Joseph S. *and others*. Title I evaluation and technical assistance: assessment and prospects. Washington, D.C., Urban Institute [February, 1971] 151 p.

Annotated under Urban Institute.

Wirt, Frederick M., *and* Michael W. Kirst. ESEA and intergovernmental relations. *In their* The political web of American schools. Boston, Little, Brown and Company, 1972. pp. 153-172.

This chapter focuses on some of the politics of ESEA Title I project approval and other program objectives from 1966 through 1971. The chapter summary states that:

"This review of political feedback and policy making highlights the interaction at every point in our federal system of stress arising from a program that reflects conflicting values . . . The initial decisions of federal administrators and Congressmen in 1965 set off stress among different individuals and interest groups at the state and local level who favored one of Title I's many goals over another. This stress created demands, some of which entered the policy process at the local level . . . and then became outputs and demands for state and federal officials to administer and cope with. . . . But as we emphasized, those who hold official education positions are not passive transmitters of demands . . . They have values and attitudes that shape their viewpoint about and responsiveness to the demands. . . . Further, the direction of Title I was shaped by the fact that the vast majority of the long-term administrators at all levels of government were socialized into the public-school-administration norms and professional outlook."

This chapter also highlights the differences between a policy output and outcome.

Xerox Corporation. A study of the leadership role in Title I programs; final report. Rochester, N.Y. [September 1967] 127 p.

The purpose of this study was to develop a series of hypotheses regarding the leadership and school climate characteristics that relate to successful implementation of projects funded under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. Utilizing an informal field survey technique, investigators studied a total of 78 Title I projects, distributed among 11 school districts. Interviews were held with 280 individuals from all levels of educational hierarchy as well as from the community. Based on the results of the field survey, 28 factors relating to the personality, behavior, attitudes, and background of the leader are hypothesized as determinants of project success. In addition, 27 school climate characteristics

are identified as having a major impact upon effective performance of the leadership role. A research design is presented to test the significance of the findings under varying environmental and program conditions.¹ (ERIC)

B. SELECTED PERIODICAL ARTICLES

Austin, Gilbert R. *and* others. The effectiveness of summer compensatory education: A review of research. Review of educational research. v. 42, Spring 1972: 171-181.

This review is concerned with the Summer Compensatory Education Program component of ESEA Title I.

"In the opinion of the reviewers, the following conclusions can be inferred:

1. Summer Compensatory Education programs in elementary mathematics, reading and language-communication have generally shown modest achievement gains. However, since no randomly formed control groups were used, 'maturation' (Campbell & Stanley, 1963) remains a threat to the validity of the studies. Further, no data were found to demonstrate whether these gains persist over time.

2. Students reported an increased desire to attend school and learn the cognitive skills. However, no data were reported to indicate if those behavior changes were observable during the school year.

3. While the average amount of federal money spent per child during the summer is approximately equal to the amount of federal money spent per child during the regular school year, there are at present no data to compare the programs in terms of student gains.

4. Few objective measures have been used to measure the possible range of student accomplishment. Even when objective measures were used, the unavailability of a control group jeopardizes the interpretation of the results.

5. Relatively few of the programs had stated behavioral objectives at the outset of the programs to provide direction for evaluation activities.

6. Many of the projects claimed to have been funded too late to allow the implementation of their proposed evaluation procedures."

The review makes four specific recommendations.

Baron, Harold M. Race and status in school spending: Chicago, 1961-1966. Journal of human resources. v. 1, Winter, 1971: 3-24.

"[A]t the beginning of the 1960's there were higher expenditures per pupil for the more privileged racial and status groups both in the central city and the suburban ring. The pressures of the civil rights movement and the new federal funds for children of poor families [ESEA, Title I] each had the effect of partially equalizing expenditures. By 1966 only the schools in high status white suburbs maintained the same degree of advantage over other groups in spending for their pupils."

Braddock, Clayton. How many can Title I really help? Southern education report, v. 4, May, 1969: 40-45.

¹ (ERIC) Description primarily from ERIC Research in Education published by U.S. Office of Education.

The trend toward "concentration of services" under Title I is discussed and analyzed with specific relation to the need for special educational services among the educationally disadvantaged.

_____. Title I: some children are left out. Southern education report, v. 4, April, 1969: 12-15.

Characteristics of school districts receiving Title I aid are compared with non-participating school districts. Reasons are offered why a number of eligible needy children are not reached.

Examples are drawn from Southern schools.

Brademas, John. The politics of financing urban education. Notre Dame journal of education, v. 2, Fall, 1971: 206+

In discussing the Federal role in urban education, the article focuses on ESEA Title I. Criticisms of Title I and some of the problems confronting urban education are discussed as are some examples of several political issues that affect Federal policy—desegregation, aid to nonpublic schools and revenue sharing proposals. Two examples of ideas aimed at stimulating state and local educational reform—State financing of the schools and the voucher experiment—and two Federal legislative proposals—measures regarding comprehensive child development and a National Institute of Education—are also examined.

Cohen, David K. Politics and research: evaluation of social action programs in education. Review of educational research, v. 40, April, 1970: 213-238.

... "Prior to 1964, the objects of evaluation in education consisted almost exclusively of small programs concerned with things as curriculum development or teacher training: they generally occurred in a single school or school districts, they sought to produce educational change on a limited scale, and they typically involved modest budgets and small research staffs. This all began to change in the mid-1960's, when the federal government and some states established broad educational improvement programs." Research and evaluation concerning Headstart, Follow-Through, but particularly ESEA Title I is discussed and analyzed. Some dimensions regarding evaluation of social action programs which emerge are the need for recognition of the diversity, obscurity, and conflict within programs and greater attention to program delivery; the need for clarity about the social and political framework of measurement; and recognition that the evaluation of social action programs in education is political. Some suggestions for an evaluation strategy are included.

The curse of crash education. Nation's business, v. 57, August, 1969: 60-62, 65.

"States and cities complain bitterly that a costly federal program [ESEA Title I] to upgrade schooling for the poor is awash in a sea of haste and waste."

Davis, Richard H. The failures of compensatory education. Education and urban society, v. 4, February, 1972: 234-248.

"In summary, then, educators need to recognize the negative effects resulting from compensatory education, which assumes that students are deficient, which seeks to change people rather than programs, and which separates individuals from their community and

culture. Instead, professional educators might begin to design a range of noncompensatory alternatives. These alternatives, if they are genuinely noncompensatory, will recognize diverse cultural patterns as equally valid. They will focus on positive accomplishments. They will change programs, not people. They will provide people with the explicit education skills and knowledge required to achieve the goals they determine. And finally, they will maintain the important link between the individual and the community."

Dentler, Robert A. Urban eyewash: a review of "Title I/Year II". *Urban review*, v. 3, February, 1969: 32-33.

The article criticizes an Office of Education report on favorable progress under Title I as being based on imprecise evaluation research.

Feller, Richard L. Strengthening the Federal Title I migrant education program. *Harvard journal of legislation*, v. 10, December, 1972: 41-73.

Statutory Comment examines the way in which the funds earmarked for the education of migrant children have been used and suggests how their use can be made more effective in the future.

Ginsburg, Alan L. and Gail R. Wilensky. Reforming Title I—a study in grant design. *National tax journal*, v. 24, June, 1971: 235-249.

"Title I of ESEA is aimed at upgrading the educationally disadvantaged. The payment formula has been severely criticized and it is our purpose to derive improved measures of the target population and the target payment rate, while examining the merits of a matching program. The principal conclusions are: (1) children from families below the SSA poverty line should be counted instead of those below the subpoverty \$2000 level or those over the arbitrary criteria of at least \$2000 in welfare; (2) payment rates should reflect the average dollar amount required to raise achievement and local cost variations; and (3) a variable matching program, with matching ratios reflecting the probability that funds will be matched and differences in local fiscal capacities, should be introduced."

Jones, Thomas H. Revising Title I Elementary and Secondary Education Act. *Planning and change*, v. 3, July, 1972: 18-27.

"This paper suggests rewriting the current funding formula in order to meet some past criticisms and current thinking about the nature of cultural disadvantage." The first section describes and analyzes the existing Title I distribution formula. The second section proposes restructuring the Title I allocation formula consistent with three broad purposes: "(1) to allow for the possibility of redefining the target population for compensatory education programs, (2) to get the available funds to those jurisdictions in greatest need, whatever definition of 'needy' pupils is used, (3) to stimulate new approaches and additional funding for compensatory education programs. . . . The proposed funding system would allocate more dollars per eligible pupil to those jurisdictions with high concentrations of eligible pupils, and less dollars per eligible child to those jurisdictions with lower concentrations."

Kiesling, Herbert J. Reading performance of disadvantaged children; cost effectiveness of educational inputs. *Education and urban society*, v. 5, November, 1972: 91-103.

"In a recently published RAND research report (Kiesling, 1971), the author presented relationships of some educational inputs and reading performance of disadvantaged California Title I pupils which utilized a highly simplified model of the compensatory education process. This paper is meant to give some extensions to those findings, including some cost imputations."

Making certain Title I funds are spent wisely; productively. Federal aid planner: a guide for school district administrators, Winter, 1972: 20-24.

What school administrators should know about new Federal guidelines on spending Title I money. Covers the extent of parent participation, publicizing the programs, attaining comparability, teacher bonuses, selecting target schools, assessing children's needs, evaluation, and pitfalls to avoid.*

Mauch, James E. Breaking tradition forges school-community ties, *Phi Delta Kappan*, v. 50, January, 1969: 270-274.

"New ties between school and community have been formed through imaginative use of Title I, ESEA, money, says this former high official in the USOE. He cites instances from communities across the U.S.—Philadelphia, Chicago, New Orleans, San Diego, Cleveland, Minneapolis, St. Louis, and elsewhere. Many seem worthy of emulation."

Murphy, Jerome P. Title I: Bureaucratic politics and poverty politics. *Inequality in education*, No. 6, 1970: 9-15.

The article analyzes some of the administrative problems of Title I in its first five years. "Federal and state officials presently have little influence over the use of the Title I funds they disburse, virtually all control lies at the local level, but some corrective action is possible, mainly through the development of countervailing local power on the part of the program's clients, the poor." "A substantially different version of this article appears in the *Harvard Educational Review*, February, 1971." (See below)

———. Title I of ESEA: the politics of implementing federal education reform. *Harvard educational review*, v. 41, February, 1971: 35-63.

"Most of the literature on Title I of ESEA focuses either on activities at the federal level—the passage and early administration of the law—or at the local level—the quality of programs or alleged abuses in using Title I funds. Little attention has been paid to the intergovernmental problems of implementing education reform in a federal system. In this article, the author examines the interaction between the different levels of government concerning Title I, focusing mainly on the program's management and on specific federal efforts to issue strong guidelines. The discussion reveals the political and bureaucratic obstacles which constrain federal efforts to redirect local priorities and explores the notion of countervailing local power as a way for the poor to gain greater leverage in the program's operation." "A substantially different version of this article appears in *Inequality in Education*, No. 6, 1970." (See above)

Myers, Phyllis. The floundering federal effort to improve city schools. *City*, v. 4, June-July 1970: 13-16.

* Description primarily from ERIC Current Index to Journals in Education published by CCM Information Corporation.

"The President and two major new studies agree that the Title I program of aid to disadvantaged children has fallen short of its goals. But they disagree as to whether the remedy is to be found in more resources—or more research."

Perkins, Carl D. The case for extending ESEA. Compact, February-March 1973: 11-13.

"My impression throughout chairing many, many hours of hearings and reading many, many reports on Title I operations is that Title I is a remarkable success in providing federal education support funds for the neediest children. It has been remarkably more effective in producing effective results than could probably have been expected in view of all of the administrative problems confronting school systems in carrying out the Title I mandate.

Oversight hearings conducted by the House Committee during the 92nd Congress indicated pretty clearly a mass of subjective evaluation of Title I of a very positive nature. In addition, objective evaluation of achievement gains made by Title I children have been more positive and numerous with each year's experience developed in operation with Title I programs. There is evidence that school districts are abandoning Title I programs which have proved unsuccessful and are adopting new and more promising programs for meeting the needs of disadvantaged children.

On the opening day of the 93rd Congress, Jan. 3, 1973, I introduced H.R. 69. It proposed to extend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act for five years. It would also extend and amend the impact areas education program.

It would call for new initiatives to develop and put into practice the forward funding of education programs.

I believe the enactment of this legislation during [this] session of Congress is essential. These programs are due to expire June 30, 1974, and unless now extended, there will be no authority to budget or appropriate funds for them next January when the budget for fiscal year 1975 will be considered by the Congress."

Quie, Albert H. Drastic reform proposed for compensatory education. Compact, May-June 1973: 33-35.

"Since the Elementary and Secondary Education Act was enacted into law in 1965, I have been concerned with the use of census data in determining the allocation of federal funds to the states. My concerns were based on the fact that census data becomes obsolete very quickly and because of my belief that economic criteria is a poor surrogate for educational need.

My bill, H.R. 5163, would distribute funds among the states on the basis of relative scores on a criterion referenced test in reading and mathematics. I propose that a scientifically drawn sample of children in each state be tested, rather than testing all children. I have been in touch with companies who have had extensive experience in the designing of a matrix sample and I am convinced, on the basis of their experiences, that a test administered to 3,000 children at any given grade level will produce results which very accurately predict the needs of all children at that age level. National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), operated by the Education Commission of the States, utilizes such a procedure.

Once allocations among the states are determined, I would leave it to each state to decide what particular form of measurement it

would use to distribute the money within the State, based on the number of educationally disadvantaged children in each school district."

Sky, Theodore. Concentration under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act: the new Part C. *Journal of law and education*, v. 1, April 1972.

The article analyzes the legislative history, purposes, administration, and pros and cons of Part C of Title I, Special Grants for Urban and Rural Schools Serving Areas with the Highest Concentrations of Children from Low-Income Families. After a brief review of statutory structure and operation of Title I in general, the major focus of the article shifts to the examination of Part C. Numerous citations from the legislation are included.

Spiegelman, Robert G. A benefit/cost model to evaluate educational programs. *Socio-Econ. Plan. Sci. (Great Britain)* v. 1, 1968: 443-460.

"Essentially, a benefit/cost model provides a procedure to evaluate a project in terms of its economic objectives. . . . In this study, we applied the model to a Title I ESEA program in San Francisco, California, during 1966-67. We found that prior to the program, about 1/3 of the disadvantaged non-Negro males and considerably more than half of the Negro males could be expected to be dropouts. The model showed, however, that a Title I program in San Francisco costing \$220 per child sufficiently raised test scores in elementary grades so that the expected dropout rates were reduced about 3 1/2 percent for non-Negro and 2 1/2 percent for Negro male pupils." Private and social benefits in lifetime earnings are also estimated.

Weidenbaum, Murray L. and Norman P. Swenson. Federal aid to education and low income areas. *Educational administration quarterly*, v. 2, Autumn, 1966: 225-233.

"We have attempted to show that Title I does indeed succeed in channeling federal government funds to low-income regions of the country to a very substantial degree. Viewed in isolation, it is a highly progressive program with respect to its tendency of yielding more than proportional amounts to low-income areas and less than proportional amounts to high-income areas, thus tending to lessen regional income differentials. . . . Government expenditures on education—with their heavy orientation to investment in human beings—may be considered in an even more favorable light vis-a-vis the more traditional welfare and income maintenance programs. This may become increasingly the case when it is realized that the new type of federal aid to education contributes both to the anti-poverty efforts, by channeling funds into low-income areas, and to raising the economic potential of the nation by increasing the productivity of its present and future labor force."

Willingham, Ed. Education report: Bell's decision on parents councils gives key role to poor in school districts. *National journal*, v. 2, November 14, 1970: 2515-2522.

An analysis of new Office of Education guidelines giving parents a greater say in the Title I decision process is presented. Background information and commentary by HEW and Congressional leaders is included.

———. School 'comparability' guidelines focus on issue of teacher seniority pay. *National journal*, v. 2, June 13, 1970: 1233-1237.

Background and analysis of the comparability guidelines issued by the Office of Education are discussed. Reaction by selected school interest groups is included.

Yudof, Mark G. The new deluder act: a Title I primer. *Inequality in education*, no. 2, January, 1970: 1-8.

State and local educational agency compliance with Office of Education Title I guidelines concerning use of funds to supplement non-Title I resources, concentration of funds per child and in target areas, and construction and equipment purchases are examined. The article suggests widespread failure to comply with administration criteria in these areas and suggests legal action as a course for redress.

———. Title I empowerment: a litigation strategy. *Inequality in education*, no. 5, June, 1970: 11-12, 16.

"Title I litigation may serve a useful purpose in piercing the veil of secrecy and phony experience which frequently surrounds the educational process."

———. Whatever happened to comparability: Title I? *Inequality in education*, no. 5, June, 1970: 22-23.

"Title I comparability, potentially a powerful weapon for bringing about an end to within-district disparities in the allocation of resources for education, has been affirmed and then delayed by Congress."

C. SELECTED CONGRESSIONAL HEARINGS (91ST AND 92ND CONGRESS)

U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Education and Labor. Equal Educational Opportunities Act. Hearings, 92d Cong., 2d sess., on H.R. 13915. Parts 1 and 2. Washington, U.S. Gov't. Print. Off., 1972. 11792 p.

Hearings held in Washington, D.C., Part 1—March 27 . . . April 12, 1972; Part 2—April 13 . . . 28, 1972.

These hearings are on the "Equal Educational Opportunities Act of 1972". Some of the funding under this proposal would have involved ESEA Title I. The hearings include prepared statements, letters, as well as supplementary materials including some compensatory education reports.

U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Subcommittee on Education. Equal Educational Opportunities Act of 1972. Hearings, 92d Cong., 2d sess., on S. 3395. Washington, U.S. Govt. Print. Off., 1972 1293 p

Hearings held March 24 . . . Sept. 25, 1972.

These hearings concern a proposal which would involve ESEA Title I funding.

U.S. Congress. Senate. Select Committee on Equal Educational Opportunity. Equal educational opportunity—1971. Hearings 92d Cong., 1st sess., Oct. 7, 1971. Washington, U.S. Govt. Print. Off., 1971: 8615-9006.

The hearings consist primarily of testimony from Drs. Michael Kirst and Stephen K. Bailey plus an appendix "Delivery System for Federal Aid to Disadvantaged Children: Problems and Prospects" submitted by Dr. Kirst.

SECTION III: ESEA TITLE II—SCHOOL LIBRARY RESOURCES, TEXTBOOKS, AND OTHER INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS

Title II authorizes a program of formula grants to the States for the acquisition of school library resources, textbooks, and other printed and published instructional materials for the use of children and teachers in public and private elementary and secondary schools within each State.

Most of the studies and assessments of the Title II program since 1966 seem to be the product of the Office of Education. The only national study and evaluation of the Title II program to date appears to be the two-volume "An Evaluative Survey Report on ESEA Title II" completed by Office of Education Title II specialists in 1972. Outside of the Office of Education, there seems to have been neither a major national nor a regional study of this program.

To clarify any confusion which might arise concerning the frequency of the Title II annual report: the Office of Education published a separate Title II annual report for FY 1966-1968 and again for FY 1972; for FY 1969 and FY 1970 there were no separate reports but some information on Title II appeared in the appropriate annual report on State Departments of Education programs (cited and annotated under SECTION V: ESEA TITLE V); for FY 1971 the Title II annual report remains unpublished.

A. SELECTED BOOKS, REPORTS AND MONOGRAPHS

U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Office of Education. Descriptive case studies of nine elementary school media centers in three inner cities; Title II Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. Washington, U.S. Govt. Print. Off. [undated] 200 p.

The purpose of these case studies was to help determine whether the introduction of media services and materials in elementary schools previously without them had significant impact on the instructional programs of the schools. Field visits were made to three schools serving children from low-income families in each of three cities: Los Angeles, Cleveland, and Buffalo. Chapters I, II, and III present the case studies from each of the three cities. Chapter IV contains a summary of observations and conclusions. Factors common to all nine schools were seen to be: Title II provided the impetus for the establishment of the media centers; Title II was an incentive for increased local funding in Los Angeles and Cleveland and increased State funding in Buffalo; the combined Federal, State, and local expenditure for media centers was too low to appreciably change curriculum, teaching methods, or pupil achievement; scheduling policy served as a deterring factor on the impact of pro-

gram materials; principals and teachers were enthusiastic about the media centers; the centers were instrumental in changing pupils attitudes toward reading and literature; and the media centers were still in the developmental stage and yet to become laboratories for learning and an integral part of the instructional programs.

———. Emphasis on excellence in school media programs; descriptive case studies special-purpose grant programs; Title II Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. Washington, U.S. Govt. Print. Off. [1969] 227 p.

Descriptive studies of media programs in eight public schools—three elementary, three junior high, and two senior high schools—selected on the basis of criteria which might produce broad representative findings. These media programs are funded by Title II special purpose grants (funds which some States have reserved from their total Title II allotment in order to develop model school media programs or to meet other special needs). The report describes the impact of the eight programs explaining why they were developed, how they operate, and what teachers, children, media specialists, and visitors think about them. The final chapter is a summary listing tabular results of questions concerning these programs. Among the changes that Title II funding, directly or indirectly, was seen as stimulating were: employment of additional media personnel at the district and school level, provision of new media services, increased school budgets for media programs, improved media facilities, improved accessibility of materials and services, provision of materials not previously available, increased involvement of media staff in classroom and other instructional activities, provisions for producing materials, and electronic information retrieval capabilities.

———. An evaluative survey report on ESEA Title II: fiscal years 1966–1968. [Ido Remer, Milbrey Jones and Mary Helen Mahar] Washington, Office of Education [1972] 2 parts.

Part I titled analysis and interpretation. Part II titled tables.

This report is a survey of the operation of the Title II program in its first three years. State departments of education and the staff of large city school districts were involved in the design and conduct of the survey. The survey was undertaken in response to four general questions: (1) Is the intent of the statute being carried out? ("The intent is being carried out to the extent possible with the funds appropriated for the program."); (2) Is the program effective in attaining the goals reflected in the statute? ("... to the extent possible. . . . however . . . even those instructional materials added under Title II to supplement those acquired through State and local efforts fell far short of being adequate to support educational programs of high quality."); (3) Has the maximum statutory authority been exercised in attaining the goals sought? The data indicates that the State departments of education have administered Title II in accordance with statutory authority.); (4) Is a revision of the law necessary? (Some revisions may be desirable such as increasing amounts available to State and local educational agencies for program administration.) The report recom-

mends that the Title II program be continued for eight reasons relating to continued need and user response. The report also makes five recommendations to increase the impact of Title II including full funding, additional support for State and local administration, and special emphasis on the use of Title II to supply high-interest, low-vocabulary materials as part of the Right-To-Read effort.

A final recommendation is that Title II be re-evaluated at the end of FY 1973.

———. Title II Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965; first annual report, fiscal year 1966. Washington, U.S. Govt. Print. Off. [1967] 73 p.

The report describes how the States and outlying territories used their Title II funds in FY 1966 to improve elementary and secondary education through acquisition of school library resources, textbooks, and other instructional materials for the use of children and teachers in public and private schools. The report includes narrative and statistical information on the uses of Title II funds, on State programs for strengthening instruction, and on demonstration centers and special-purpose grants.

———. Title II Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965; second annual report, fiscal year 1967. Washington, U.S. Govt. Print. Off. [1969] 78 p.

The report describes how the States, outlying territories, and Bureau of Indian Affairs used their Title II funds in FY 1967 to improve elementary and secondary education through acquisition of school library resources, textbooks, and other instructional materials for the use of children and teachers in public and private schools. The report includes narrative and statistical information on participation in Title II, on categories of acquisitions, on State programs for strengthening instruction through improved resources and services, and on benefits for Indian children and teachers in Bureau of Indian Affairs schools. Information on special purpose grant programs in 19 States is also included.

———. Title II Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965; third annual report, fiscal year 1968. Washington, U.S. Govt. Print. Off. [1971] 101 p.

The report describes how the States, outlying territories, and Bureau of Indian Affairs used their Title II funds in FY 1968 to improve elementary and secondary education through acquisitions of school library resources, textbooks, and other instructional materials for the use of children and teachers in public and private schools. The report includes narrative and statistical information on participation in the Title II program, on categories of acquisition, on State programs for strengthening instruction through improved resources and services, and on benefits for Indian children and teachers in Bureau of Indian Affairs schools. Information on the special purpose grant program in 30 States is also included.

———. Title II Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965; Annual Report Fiscal Year 1972. Washington, U.S. Govt. Print. Off. [1973] 66 p.

"This report is a synthesis of the ESEA title II fiscal year 1972 Narrative Reports submitted by each State Department of Educa-

tion to the U.S. Office of Education. The examples from States cited to illustrate the various topics covered by the report, are arranged in order by the geographic regions—Northeast, Southeast, Upper Midwest, Mid-Continent, Western. The report has evidence that materials made available under title II contributed to a great extent to innovations in instruction and to flexibility in meeting the needs of children and teachers in the process of education."

The report includes sections on the State management of the Title II program, program development, Title II cooperation with the Right-to-Read program, services to private schoolchildren and teachers, evaluation and dissemination, and needs. The final section concludes: "In spite of the progress made under title II, there are still great needs for instructional materials for use in every subject and in every grade in elementary and secondary schools. There is also need for professional materials for teachers, and for additional school media personnel to assist with the selection, acquisition, organization, and use of materials."

———. Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education. How the ESEA Title II meets the educational needs for poor children; a special report. Washington [1969] 25 p.

This special report details the contributions made by Title II in providing poor children with increased quantities of school library resources, textbooks, and other printed and published instructional materials. Statistical tables are included providing such information as that, in the first two years, over 80 percent of the children participating in Title I ESEA programs also benefited from Title II.

B. SELECTED PERIODICAL ARTICLES

Gibbs, Helen M. Title II of ESEA. *Phi Delta Kappan*, v. 49, Feb. 1968: 321-323.

Brief article discussing the accomplishments of Title II in FY 1966. LaNoue, George R. Public library principles and Title II. *Wilson library bulletin*, v. 41, March 1967: 700-707.

"Nowhere is the need for re-examination more evident than in Title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Although the purpose of Title II—to provide books and other learning materials for all children and teachers—is completely admirable, the prevailing administration of the program violates sound principles of library practice, Congressional legislative intent, and separation of church and state."

———. The Title II trap. *Phi Delta Kappan*, v. 47, June 1966: 558-565.

"Distribution of ESEA Title II funds has created serious problems for educators charged with applying the act. Mr. LaNoue discusses them with the benefit of constitutional analysis and close study of ESEA development.

* * * * *

"Authorities representing the National Education Association and the National Catholic Welfare Conference then comment on his position."

SECTION IV: ESEA TITLE III—SUPPLEMENTARY EDUCATIONAL CENTERS AND SERVICES; GUIDANCE, COUNSELING, AND TESTING

Title III authorizes appropriations for grants for supplementary educational centers and services, for exemplary elementary and secondary school programs, and for guidance, counseling and testing purposes. Eighty-five percent of the total Title III appropriation available to each State is allotted via formula grant to each State for the purposes of carrying out its Title III State plan. The remaining fifteen percent of each State's total Title III apportionment is reserved to the Commissioner of Education for making project grants directly to local educational agencies for special programs and projects. Under both the State grant (85%) and special project grant (15%) programs, fifteen percent of the funds must be used for programs or projects to meet the special educational needs of handicapped children.

From the time of enactment in 1965 (P.L. 89-10) through 1967, Title III was administered directly by the Office of Education. The Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1967 (P.L. 90-247), however, reassigned to the States the major responsibility for the administration of most Title III projects.

A number of Title III studies to date either have highlighted especially noteworthy Title III projects or otherwise have focused on the content and/or impact of certain selected projects. But from the evidence available, it appears that there has never been an evaluative study of the *entire Title III* program to determine its national impact on the education of schoolchildren. In FY 1973, the Office of Planning, Budgeting, and Evaluation within the Office of Education contracted with the Rand Corporation for a major study of change agent programs—including ESEA Title III. This study when it is completed might provide some insight on the question of the national impact of Title III.

A. SELECTED BOOKS, REPORTS, AND MONOGRAPHS

Benson, Charles S. and James W. Guthrie. A search for new energy: ESEA Title III; an essay on federal incentives and local and state educational initiative. Washington, George Washington University [December 1968] 70 p.

This study is based on information obtained as a result of visits to 60 projects located in 30 states and focuses on the ability of Title III to encourage local educational reform and to consider implications for future program activities. At each project, visits with key persons were structured by an open-ended questionnaire. In addition, the perceptions of school board members and other community spokesmen were noted. Title III projects were found to be particularly effective in encouraging (1) new instructional modes and curricula formats, (2) new educational technology, (3) systematic

resource allocation, (4) cooperation and resource sharing among local school districts (5) establishment of special education programs, and (6) incentives to persons with extraordinary talents.¹ (ERIC)

Brightman, Jerome B. The continuation rate of three-year ESEA Title III projects: a report to the President's National Advisory Council (ESEA Title III). [December 15, 1971] 41 p.

Manuscript.

"Superintendents of 788 school districts which received ESEA Title III funds for three-year operational grants beginning in 1966, 1967, and 1968 were contacted in September, 1971, regarding the continuation of their Title III projects after Federal funding expired. There were 679 responses. For the purposes of the questionnaire which was sent to the superintendents, 'continuation' meant that the project survived beyond the federal funding period and continued to meet the original needs and objectives. This study found of the projects funded from 1966-69, 64.4% were continued beyond federal funding and 51.5% were still in operation in October, 1971. For projects funded from 1967-70, the percentages were 67% and 53.9% respectively while projects funded from 1968-71 had continuation rates of 76% and 56% respectively."

Hearn, Norman E. Innovative education programs: a study of the influence of selected variables upon their continuation following the termination of three-year ESEA Title III grants. Washington, George Washington University [September 30, 1969] 322 p.

A dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the School of Education of The George Washington University.

A study of 330 projects which after three years of Title III funding, showed that 85% were continuing one year after the termination of Title III funding. Of these continued projects, 42% were operating on a smaller scale and 18% had been expanded.

Miller, Richard L., *director*. The second national study of PACE. Fairfax, Va., Fairfax County Public Schools, Center for Effecting Educational Change. [1968] 6v.

Volume 1, "Evaluation and PACE", is an analysis of 21 funded Title III proposals. Three basic inadequacies were found: (1) the lack of adequate theory, models, and designs to guide evaluative activity, (2) the lack of trained personnel, and (3) the lack of appropriate data collection techniques and data processing facilities. Volume 3, "A Comprehensive Model for Managing an ESEA Project from Conception to Culmination," concerns the need for a more comprehensive approach to Title III planning, implementation, and evaluation and includes a model designed to assist all phases of a PACE project. Volume 4, "Analysis and Evaluation of 137 ESEA Title III Planning and Operational Grants" sought to determine the overall influence and impact on education of a sample of terminated ESEA Title III operational and planning grants. The sample consisted of 94 terminated planning grants

¹ Description primarily from ERIC Research in Education published by U.S. Office of Education.

and 43 terminated operational grants. Volume 5, "The Views of 920 PACE Project Directors," provides an overall view of PACE as seen by project directors. Volume 6, "PACE; Catalyst for Change," consists of reports with criticisms and recommendations concerning PACE from the vantage point of 17 special consultants.

———. *Catalyst for change: national study of ESEA Title III (PACE)*. In *U.S. Congress, Senate, Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, Subcommittee on Education*. Noand working papers concerning the administration of programs authorized under Title III of Public Law 89-10 . . . Washington, U.S. Govt. Print. Off., 1967. 557 p. (90th Congress, 1st session)

At the head of title: Committee Print

The purpose of this study is to analyze and appraise Title III proposals approved during the first year, to look for gaps between project direction and proposal objectives, to study overall directions and developments of PACE, to view Title III against the broader context of trends in American education, and to study interrelationships of PACE to the various ESEA titles and other programs. Twenty special consultants focus on 17 areas dominant during the first three funding periods. The report has two sections: section A—the overview—written by the director and containing 25 recommendations relating to directions and developments of Title III; and section B containing the individual reports and recommendations of the 20 special consultants.

Polemeni, Anthony John. A study of Title III projects, Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, after the approved funding periods. Jamaica, New York, Saint Johns University [April 1970] 211 p.

A study of 149 projects which were completed or terminated by December 1967. Of the 149 projects surveyed, 120 were discontinued after Title III funds were terminated; another five were discontinued shortly thereafter; and 24 were still in operation in fiscal 1969. The study contends that the relatively low level of continuation was due to the projects' inability to continue the "seed money" objective of the legislation. However, Polemeni held that a 16 percent continuation rate for projects supported by "risk money" was not a discouraging "rate of return". Project directors gave "inability to absorb the costs" as the major reason for the projects not being continued with local funds.

[President's] National Advisory Council on Supplementary Centers and Services. Annual report ESEA Title III [the fifth annual report]. Washington [1973] 32 p.

The Council's fifth annual report makes recommendations as to the future of Title III, since during 1973 the Congress will be receiving the justification for continued commitment to the ESEA and its objectives. The report includes sections on the strengths of Title III, recent accomplishments, problems and recommendations (eleven), and a summary of State allocations from FY 1966 to FY 1973.

The report states in part:

"Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act is the most effective force in American education for constructive innovation and change. Since its enactment by Congress in 1965, Title III has made federal funds available to the states for projects which apply new methods and research to educational problems in local elementary and secondary schools. In doing so, Title III has stimulated interest in improved educational practices at the grassroots level of education and has brought research and development directly into the classroom.

* * * * *

"The national interest in innovative change in education has been well expressed and effectively carried out in Title III of ESEA. This legislation, which is now coming to maturity and which has a steadily stronger and more capable administration in the states, seems the best vehicle for continuing the federal presence in this vital educational area."

———. Educational reform through innovation; the third annual report . . . Washington [1971] 20 p.

This third annual report of Title III makes ten recommendations for improving Title III including ones relating to funding, involvement of non-profit schoolchildren, consolidation of federal programs, assessment of educational needs, reporting, and diffusion of promising practices. There is also a section on State Advisory Council activities and a listing of major contributions of Title III including a brief description of some noteworthy projects.

———. PACE: Transition of concept; the first report . . . Washington [1969] 41 p.

The first report of the Advisory Council concerns ESEA Title III in its first three years, from 1966 to 1968. The report notes the original purpose of Title III and discusses its first two years under Federal administration. The report then discusses the Title III program in 1968 and particularly the achievements and problems of transition from a Federal to State administered program. Factors concerning project planning and approval, attitudes of project directors toward Federal support and transition, present evaluations of PACE, and future needs as seen by project directors are considered. The Advisory Council makes 17 recommendations for strengthening and improving Title III at the federal, state, and project level.

———. The rocky road called innovation; the second annual report . . . Washington [1970] 21 p.

The report makes three points: (1) ESEA Title III is working; (2) The original emphasis on innovation and creative programs is being eroded; the drift is toward a service-type project; with all other federal funding except Title III emphasizing the more practical aspects, the Advisory Council strongly believes that 'risk capital' or innovation money is essential; (3) the Council believes educators need to examine their commitment to innovation and change and believe that PACE remains the best single example of a positive force for innovation and change. The report particularly discusses the transition of Title III from a Federal to State administered pro-

gram. Eight specific recommendations concerning Title III are included.

———. Time for a progress report: ESEA Title III; the fourth annual report. Washington [1972] 52 p.

This annual report on Title III is a progress report after six years of Title III programs. Attention is given to the continuation rate of Title III projects after federal funding has terminated, the nature and role of the State Advisory Councils, views from the States on Title III, and summaries of eleven projects selected as models for dissemination by a nation wide assessment of Title III conducted by the Advisory Council. The report also includes a list of projects identified by the States as their most exemplary for fiscal year 1971, eleven recommendations by the Advisory Council for the improvement of Title III, and a section of personal observations by Council members.

B. SELECTED PERIODICAL ARTICLES

Hearn, Norman E. The adoption rate of Title III innovations after the end of federal funding. *Educational technology*, v. 10, November, 1970: 43-45.

A summary article concerning the Title III continuation rate based on a research study by the author (Innovative Educational Programs which is reviewed under Part A of this SECTION). The article notes a high rate of project continuation using non-Federal funding.

———. When sugar daddy's gone, does baby starve? (or) a study of the adoption rate of ESEA Title III innovations when Federal funds were terminated. *Phi Delta Kappan*, v. 52, September, 1970: 59-61.

A summary article concerning the continuation rate of Title III projects. (See previous citation.)

House, Ernest R., Joe Milan Steele, and Thomas Kerins. What happens when sugar daddy evaluates his own baby? *Phi Delta Kappan*, v. 52, December 1970: 247-482.

The authors take issue with Norman Hearn's methodology in studying continuation of Title III projects after Federal funding stops. Calling the study misleading and inaccurate, the authors say in part that "... the root of this misinformation is the lack of validity of the data reported by superintendents. Self-report information on one's own performance and mailed questionnaires is notoriously unreliable." A reply by Hearn is included.

Kearns, Doris. The growth and development of Title III. *ESEA. Educational technology*, v. 9, May, 1969: 7-14.

Article explains the legislative background of Title III from the 1964 Task Force on Education to its enactment into public law. The article then discusses the implementation of Title III especially from the standpoint of the Office of Education noting such problems as that "no special funds were set aside for the purpose of planning and preparing for the implementation of ESEA ..." and the shortage of manpower to administrate Title III within the Office of Education.

O'Donnell, C. Michael. Assessing innovation in New England's schools. *Educational technology*, v. 11, December, 1971: 52-54.

In the Spring of 1969, the New England Educational Assessment Project undertook a study to identify components of the process of innovation. "A purpose of the investigation was to select and describe several innovations that exemplified change and to report these findings to educational leaders." Both Title III and non-Title III innovations were examined. Among their findings relating to Title III projects:

"Several of the projects visited by the committees were funded with Title III (ESEA) funds. When asked about the potential for continuation after the expiration of the Title III grant, most project directors indicated that adoption of the program with local school funds would be difficult or improbable. In these situations, there seemed little evidence of planning for sustaining the innovation when outside support terminated. The commitment to the innovation was often limited to the duration of the funding period."

O'Neill, Michael. Education without schools: idea and reality. *Notre Dame journal of education*, v. 1, Spring, 1970: 49-59.

In an article discussing the "education without schools" movement, considerable attention is given to the current and potential role of ESEA Title III.

"Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) is an excellent example of what can happen to imaginative proposals which fail to allow for the structure of incentives within the public school bureaucracy. Title III was designed to stimulate 'innovative and exemplary' educational projects, and specifically encouraged breaking out of the school establishment.

* * * * *

"In fact, Title III during the last five years has produced only a bare handful of such projects. There is even reason to believe that the official Title III statistics on the involvement of nonschool agencies overstate the reality.

* * * * *

"The failure of Title III to stimulate more nonschool efforts can be explained by the simple axiom that no organization freely gives away money which it can use itself. Virtually all schools and school districts feel they need more money. Virtually all school systems see themselves as fundamentally capable of any educational task."

* * * * *

"One of the most promising ways of promoting nonschool education, even given the criticism above, is still Title III of ESEA. But further specifications of the law are necessary. Congress could, for instance, amend the law to stipulate that a certain percentage of Title III funds must be subcontracted to nonschool agencies . . . Further, Congress might direct that tougher regulations be developed and that there be strict enforcement as well as significant penalties for noncompliance."

Pettigrew, Thomas F. Racial implications of Title III, ESEA. *Inequality in education*, v. 5, October-November, 1967: 37-47.

Article discusses the first year of Title III proposals with relation to race.

"The racial implications of Title III proposals can be conveniently discussed under seven interrelated headings: (1) general avoidance of the racial issue; (2) the pork barrel and antimetropolitan character of most of the funding; (3) the institutionalization of further racial separation; (4) the title I-like character of many proposals; (5) the problem of basic funding; (6) the difficulty of generating genuine innovation; and finally, (7) the setting of precedents for the future."

Six recommendations are included regarding a different Title III project-finding approach with more emphasis on packaged metropolitan grants and more meritorious programs; the "complete avoidance of proposals which would further institutionalize racial separation: the encouragement of compensatory programs that bring together, not separate, the disadvantaged and the advantaged; facing squarely the problem of supplanting local expenditures; favored treatment and affirmative recruitment of title III projects which foster metropolitanism, large and heterogeneous educational complexes, and effective racial integration; and the upgrading of title III proposals."

Title III: Ideas for innovation are still in demand. Federal aid planner. February, 1972: 22-34.

The past performance and future prospect of the ESEA Title III program is discussed. Examples of successful Title III programs in English, physical fitness, reading, and in a multimedia language project are presented. The criteria used for selecting a school proposal for funding are presented.

SECTION V: ESEA TITLE V—STRENGTHENING STATE AND LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES

Title V authorizes several grant programs. *Part A* authorizes a program of grants to *State* educational agencies to strengthen leadership resources and promote programs which identify and meet State educational needs. Ninety-five percent of Part A funds are distributed among the States according to formula grant while the remaining five percent are reserved to the Commissioner for special project grants. *Part B* authorizes a program of project grants to *local* educational agencies to strengthen their leadership resources and promote programs which identify and meet local school district needs. *Part C* authorizes grants for comprehensive planning or evaluation to either State or local educational agencies in order to improve their capacity in providing quality educational opportunities. Through FY 1973, no funds have been appropriated for Part B of Title V.

P.L. 91-230 amended Title V by establishing a National Council on Quality in Education to be appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. It was envisioned that this National Council would assume some of the responsibilities of the Advisory Council on State Departments of Education in the Office of Education. However, although the OE Advisory Council was abolished, the National Council has never been appointed. The Advisory Council had issued five annual reports (only 1 in this SECTION) regarding ESEA Title V and a number of other State grant programs. For the purposes of continuity, the Office of Education issued in 1972 an annual report for FY 1970 similar in format and treatment to those of the former Advisory Council.

A. SELECTED BOOKS, REPORTS, AND MONOGRAPHS

Center for Educational Policy Research. Grease the squeaky wheel: a report on the implementation of Title V of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. Grants to Strengthen State Departments of Education. [Jerome T. Murphy] Cambridge, Harvard Graduate School of Education. [February 1973] 435 p.

This study examines the impact of the Title V program on State Educational Agencies. The author states that "*Title V is an eight-year-old illustration of one variety of revenue sharing with the states.*" (Author emphasis).

"The study describes how the federal money was spent in nine SEA's (particularly in Massachusetts, New York, and South Carolina). It examines the ways in which these SEA's have been affected by Title V, including a hoped-for growth in staff and budget levels, and improvements in SEA management, services and leadership."

* * * * *

"The study found that Title V was used mainly to grease squeaky wheels, or to support pre-existing priorities, and was distributed in

an *ad hoc* fashion largely on the basis of intraorganizational competition, not planning. Projects were considered not because the SEA's searched everywhere for the best alternatives, but largely because different SEA subunits were already—prior to Title V—pre-disposed toward certain additional activities and thought they fit within the vague notion of “strengthening” the agency. Heavy emphasis was placed on activities which the state legislatures had not funded, or probably would not fund. In many cases, projects were simply taken “off the shelf” when Title V became available (p. 206).”

Once begun, the flow of new funds was mainly used for the continuing subsidy of the projects first established. *The original flexibility of Title V to meet emerging priorities was short-lived* (p. 210).

“Basic organizational change (South Carolina) resulted from extraorganizational pressure, not the free money. Also, those external pressures promoting change (e.g., a shift in state politics or a breakdown in traditions) are largely beyond manipulation by the federal government (p. 211).”

“The study concludes that the conventional explanations of Title V's performance (sturdy congressional appropriations, low SEA salaries, inadequate time for preplanning, ineptitude of SEA officials, etc.) do not fully explain why Title V fell short of some hopes. An explanation of the Title V outcomes must take into account the enduring attributes of organizations: traditions, norms and standard operating procedures; subunits with conflicting goals and expansionary tendencies; a preoccupation with short-term problems; search procedures that accept “good enough” solutions rather than optimal ones; and activities that continue from year to year, outliving their usefulness. Indeed, the underlying reasons why Title V did not promote basic institutional change may have as much to do with the way complex organizations typically behave with free money as with particular institutional or individual shortcomings (p. 215).”

“The study suggested that a major problem in 1965 was the way the reformers thought about complex organizations and how they work. Their assumption that Title V decisions would grow out of a ‘rational’ process and, in turn, the SEA's would change in a flexible fashion, led to unrealistic expectations (p. 215).”

“The last chapter explores various approaches for further strengthening SEA's. They range from conventional option (financial assistance, federal regulations and technical assistance) to approaches that are more controversial (differential treatment and governmental accountability). Various conceptions of planning were also examined.

After examining political and organizational barriers to a variety of federally-initiated change efforts, the study concludes by stressing the extreme difficulty in reforming complex organizations like SEA's. While some approaches seem better than others for making gradual progress, there are no simple ways for the federal government to promote rapid governmental reform in the states. (p. 289)."

Murphy, Jerome T. Grease the squeaky wheel; a report on the implementation of Title V of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Grants to Strengthen State Departments of Education. Cambridge, Center for Educational Policy Research, Harvard Graduate School of Education [February, 1973] 435 p.

Annotated under the Center for Educational Policy Research.

Smith, Kenneth E. The impact of Title V on State departments of education. In Campbell, Roald E., Gerald E. Sroufe, and Donald H. Layton (eds.) Strengthening State Departments of education. Chicago, Midwest Administration Center, The University of Chicago [June, 1967] p. 61-76.

"The purpose of this chapter is to examine how state departments of education initially have responded to the opportunity and the challenge presented by Title V. We will discuss Title V's impact on state departments of education with respect to three topics: 1) the financial and professional manpower resources available; 2) the matrix of activities carried on by state departments of education; and 3) staffing and professional personnel policies."

* * * * *

In our analysis of the utility of Title V funds in strengthening state departments of education we have been somewhat more cautious in our appraisal. We have indicated previously our concern that the funds, especially in smaller state departments of education, were being used chiefly to provide more of the traditional services. Insufficient attention has been paid, we feel, to those activities included under the broad heading of research and development, and public information and support. Overmuch attention has been concentrated on activities such as consultation to local districts.

Further, we are now concerned that many departments seem intent upon providing new or extended services with the same personnel, or more of the same kind of personnel. Although chief state school officers indicated considerable difficulty in staffing positions, especially those reflecting new departmental directions, they provided virtually no evidence that they have been considering procedures which might develop new sources, new career programs, or new inducements to attract top educators with a variety of talents."

U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Office of Education. Advisory Council on State Departments of Education. The federal-state partnership for education: the fifth annual report of the Advisory Council . . . Washington, U.S. Govt. Print. Off. [1970] 182 p.

The advisory Council's report reviews the administration of Title V during FY 1969. The report surveys the contributions of Title V to the various State departments of education and highlights some typical findings and recommendations resulting from in-depth State management reviews. Among such findings and recommendations

are those relating to planning, evaluation, project development, review, and monitoring, project administration and supervision. Other Federal programs aiding State educational agencies are also treated briefly. The Advisory Council itself makes a number of specific recommendations including ones relating to full funding and late appropriations, comprehensive planning, improved administration, advisory councils, program consolidation, program accountability, OE program reviews, and involvement of State departments in planning and implementation of the Right To Read and environmental education programs.

———. Focus on the future—education in the states; the third annual report of the Advisory Council . . . *In U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Subcommittee on Education.* Notes and working papers concerning the administration of programs authorized under Title V of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Public Law 89-10 . . . Washington, U.S. Govt. Print. Off., 1968. 84 p. (90th Congress, 2nd session)

At the head of title: Committee Print

The Advisory Council reviews the administration of programs funded under Title V. Topics covered include staffing problems, use of funds and personnel, imbalances in development, limited planning capacities, special project grants, and other federal programs aiding State educational agencies. The Council makes five recommendations including emphasis on State agency planning, full funding, timely appropriations, a hold-harmless provision with any new distribution formula or program consolidation, and encouragement to State departments in improving education training activities.

———. Improving state leadership in education: an annual report proving state leadership in education: an annual report of the Advisory Council . . . Washington, U.S. Govt. Print. Off. [1966] 145 p.

The report summarizes the steps taken by the States and Federal government to implement the leadership development provisions of Title V and improve State agency programs and services. In addition it also provides a resume of the status of State education department programs prior to Title V activities and reviews certain other Federal programs which affect State education agencies. Among its recommendations, the Advisory Council seeks a continued high priority for Title V, that State matching provisions in the legislation be deferred at least two additional years, that State authority for other relevant Federal programs be enlarged, that a fellowship program for State educational agency personnel be established, and that continued emphasis in FY 1967 be given to proposals showing promise of increasing the administrative capacities of State education agencies.

———. Reinforcing the role of States in education; the second annual report of the Advisory Council . . . Washington, U.S. Govt. Print. Off. [1967] 30 p.; appendices.

The report focuses on the implementation and administration of Title V during its first year, FY 1966, and provides information on

the uses of both basic and special project grants by the States. In particular, the report highlights how Title V basic grants are helping State educational agencies to expand their staffs thus increasing their capacity for planning, evaluation, administration, and service to local school districts. Similarly, the report notes a number of promising special grant programs which focus on problems common to all or several States. Nine Advisory Council recommendations include full-funding of Title V, changes in the allotment formula to assist smaller States, transfer to the States of project approval authority for 85% of the ESEA, Title III appropriation, study of the idea of consolidation of administrative funds authorized under several Federal programs, and consideration of the consolidation of similar Federal education programs. The Council also recommends that State education departments consider and plan for their future role. In addition, these departments should also increase their funding support of State education agencies. Finally, the Council recommends a comprehensive study of the place of Federal support in relation to total support for all aspects of American education.

—The state of the State departments of education: the fourth annual report of the advisory council . . . Washington, U.S. Govt. Print. Off. [1969] 166 p.

The Advisory Council reviews the administration of Title V programs and makes recommendations for improvements. The Council finds marked progress in Title V reinforcing the capacity of State agencies to identify and meet the educational needs of their states and to provide leadership and service to local school systems. Topics covered in the report include Title V fund and staff utilization, directions of growth, organization and staffing, State review, visits, and reports, special project grants, projects and their administration, and other Federal programs aiding State education agencies. State-by-State project reports and a variety of statistical tables are included. The Council makes eleven recommendations concerning Title V planning, evaluation, administration and support, full funding, and substantial new funding to demonstrate methods of coping with critical urban educational problems.

U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education. State departments of education and federal programs; annual report fiscal year 1970. Washington, U.S. Govt. Print. Off. [1972] 161 p.

Note: P.L. 91-230 abolished the Title V Advisory Council on State Departments of Education and certain other advisory bodies in favor of a single National Council on Quality in Education. The Advisory Council had issued five annual reports and, for the purposes of continuity, the general format and treatment of programs in this report is similar to these previous Advisory Council reports.

The report reviews the administration of programs funded under Title V. Attention is given to the use and impact of Title V funding at the State and local level. Progress in the State Management Review Program is noted including the fact that the first cycle of review was completed in nearly every state in FY 1971 and that, beginning in FY 1972, the three year review cycle will be repeated. Summaries of Title V projects within the States as well as multi-

state projects are included. In addition, the report contains information on four other State plan-State grant programs: ESEA, Section 404, Comprehensive Educational Planning and Evaluation in the States; ESEA, Title II; NDEA, Title III; and NDEA, Title V, Part A, Guidance, Counseling, and Testing.

U.S. *Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Education Division, Office of Education*. State departments of education, State boards of education, and Chief State school officers. [Sam P. Harris] Washington, U.S. Govt. Print. Off. [1973] 235 p.

While not directly concerned with the ESEA Title V program, this report is a significant reference document for an understanding of the structure and organization of State educational agencies.

"In addition to narrative and tabular summaries of pertinent data of the State education agencies, State boards of education, and chief State school officers, the compilation contains a description of the legally created State coordinating or governing agency for public higher education, although the greater emphasis is placed upon public education at the elementary and secondary levels. Inclusion of the legally established higher education coordinating authority, if any, for a State should not be construed to mean that it is necessarily related or dependent in any way in terms of scope of authority, administrative functions, or duties on the State department of education. Pains have been taken to define the relationship in each State. The compilation is divided into two parts: Part One consists of five chapters—I, The State Department of Education; II, The State Board of Education; III, The Chief State School Officer; IV, State-wide Coordinating Agencies for Higher Education; and V, Summary of Basic Ideas and Implications for State-Level Educational Governance. Part Two presents, for each State, basic data as of September 1972 on (1) the State education agency, including the State department of education, State board of education, chief State school officer, and (2) the legally established statewide agency for higher education."

B. SELECTED PERIODICAL ARTICLES

Psenick, Leroy F. The role of the State social studies specialist. *Social education*, v. 34, December 1970: 909-916.

The role of ESEA Title V and NDEA Title III funding in increasing the number of State social studies specialists is explored.

SECTION VI: ESEA TITLE VII—BILINGUAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Title VII authorizes appropriations for project grants to local educational agencies to develop and implement programs, services, and activities which meet the special educational needs of children of limited English-speaking ability.

Since the Bilingual Education Act was added to the ESEA in 1968 by P.L. 90-247, no comparative national or regional evaluation of Title VII bilingual projects has been completed. The Office of Education indicates, however, that Development Associates Incorporated is currently completing a process evaluation—gathering information on the characteristics of various Title VII projects, participants, and teachers—which should be available by the end of 1973. Present Office of Education plans include following this process evaluation with an impact evaluation of the Title VII program.

Regarding periodical articles, it should be noted that although there is an extensive literature on bilingual-bicultural education in general or reporting on events of an individual project, there seems to be a lack of comparative, analytical materials focusing particularly on Title VII. As a result, the selected articles section has been eliminated from this SECTION.

A. SELECTED BOOKS, REPORTS, AND MONOGRAPHS

Andersson, Theodore *and* Mildred Boyer. Bilingual schooling in the United States. Austin, Texas, Southwest Educational Development Laboratory [1970] 2 v.

Annotated under Southwest Educational Development Laboratory.

National Consortia for Bilingual Education. Report of survey findings: assessment of needs of bilingual education programs. Fort Worth, Texas, National Consortia for Bilingual Education [1971] 75 p.

The report presents the findings of an initial assessment of curriculum-related needs among selected Title VII and non-Title VII bilingual education projects. The report (1) includes descriptive data about the environment and learners in Title VII projects which would affect use of materials, (2) identifies project materials produced or in production in bilingual programs according to five basic components: community involvement, learner materials development, evaluation, instructional systems, and staff development, and (3) identifies curriculum-related materials needs of operating bilingual programs. The report also includes a model for the bilingual materials packaging process as a means for on-going materials identification, selection, processing, and dissemination.

Southwest Educational Development Laboratory. Bilingual schooling in the United States. [Theodore Andersson and Mildred Boyer] Austin, Texas [1970] 2 v.

"This study was conducted by the Southwest Educational Development Laboratory with support from the U.S. Office of Education to give guidance and direction to those interested in developing programs that may be eligible for support through the Bilingual Education Act, Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

* * * * *

As specified in the contract Scope of Work, the monograph includes a history of bilingual schooling, both in the United States and in other parts of the world; alternative concepts of bilingual schooling; sample curriculum models; implications for education and society; and an outline of needs, as related to action and research."

SECTION VII: ESEA TITLE VIII—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Title VIII contains authorizations for five separate project grant programs—only three of which were funded in FY 1973. These three programs which received an appropriation from the Congress in FY 1973 were: the Dropout Prevention Program, which authorizes grants for demonstration projects to reduce the number of school dropouts in areas with high concentrations of children from low-income families; the program of Demonstration Projects to Improve School Nutrition and Health Services, which authorizes grants in areas with concentrations of low-income families; and the Special Programs and Projects to Improve the Educational Opportunities for Indian Children (added to Title VIII by P.L. 92-318), which authorizes grants to plan, test, and demonstrate the effectiveness of programs designed to improve Indian educational opportunities. The two other project grant programs authorized under Title VIII, but never funded are: a Research and Demonstration Projects in Correction Education Services program and the Consumers' Education Program added to Title VIII by the Education Amendments of 1972 (P.L. 92-318).

To date, there appears to be no published overall program study and evaluation for either the Dropout Prevention or Nutrition and Health Services programs. In addition, while there exists both an extensive dropout and nutrition needs literature, there does not seem to be a literature which focuses on either of these ESEA programs beyond the individual project level. Consequently, the best sources for evaluative information concerning these two programs at this time would appear to be the budget justification information and subsequent discussion contained in the hearings before the Appropriations Committees for FY 1972 and FY 1973 (see SECTION I: MULTITITLE) or the annual evaluation information from the OE Office of Planning, Budgeting and Evaluation reports for FY 1971 and FY 1972 (see SECTION I: MULTITITLE).

Since the Indian education provisions added to Title VIII in 1972 by P.L. 92-318 are too recent for any evaluative studies, the hearing citation in this SECTION is for the purposes of background on this new Indian education program.

SELECTED CONGRESSIONAL HEARINGS (91ST AND 92ND CONGRESS)

U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Education and Labor. General Subcommittee on Education. Indian Education Act of 1971. Hearings, 92nd Cong., 2d sess., on H.R. 8937 and S. 2482. Washington, U.S. Govt. Print. Off., 1972. 654 p.

Hearings held in Gallup, New Mex., January 3 and 4; Riverside, Calif., January 6; Seattle, Wash., January 8; Anchorage, Alaska, January 10; Minneapolis, Minn., March 11, 1972.

These hearings concerned bills to amend ESEA to provide for administration of programs of Indian education and for other purposes.

U.S. Congress, Senate, Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, Subcommittee on Education, Education amendments of 1971. Hearings. 92d Cong., 1st sess., on S. 659. Part 4. Washington, U.S. Govt. Print. Off., 1971: 1677-2177.

Hearings held on April 28, 29, and May 6, 1971.

These hearings concern an amendment to S. 659 to improve Indian education opportunities; in part by amending ESEA.

SECTION VIII: ESEA TITLE IX—ETHNIC HERITAGE PROGRAM

Title IX authorizes project grants for planning, developing, establishing, and operating ethnic heritage programs which provide opportunities for students to learn about the nature of their own cultural heritage as well as the contributions of other ethnic groups to the Nation.

Title IX was added to the ESEA by the Education Amendments of 1972 (P.L. 92-318). The program did not receive an appropriation in FY 1973 and, consequently, there are no projects funded under this Title to date. The citations in this SECTION primarily provide background on the purposes and intent of Title IX.

A. SELECTED BOOKS, REPORTS AND MONOGRAPHS

Pucinski, Roman. Ethnic studies and urban reality. *In* Wenk, M., S. M. Tomasi, and G. Baroni (editors). *Pieces of a dream: the ethnic worker's crisis with America*. New York, Center for Migration Studies [1972]: 75-88.

This paper explores the need and develops the rationale for the Ethnic Heritage Studies proposal introduced in the 91st and 92nd Congresses by Mr. Pucinski.

Chweiker, Richard S. Ethnic studies: toward a new pluralism in America. *In* Wenk, M., S. M. Tomasi and G. Baroni (editors). *Pieces of a dream: the ethnic worker's crisis with America*. New York, Center for Migration Studies [1972]: 65-71.

The article discusses efforts to enact ethnic studies legislation in the 91st and 92nd Congress, and especially the Ethnic Heritage Studies Centers Act of 1971.

B. SELECTED CONGRESSIONAL HEARINGS (91ST CONGRESS)

U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Education and Labor. General Subcommittee on Education. Hearings. 91st Cong., 2nd sess., on H.R. 14910. Washington. U.S. Govt. Print. Off., 1970. 363 p.

Hearings held in Washington, D.C. February 16, 17, 18, 24, 26; March 4, 5, 19; and May 6, 1970.

These hearings were concerned with H.R. 14910, a bill to provide a program to improve the opportunity of students in elementary and secondary schools to study the cultural heritages of the major ethnic groups in the Nation. A number of provisions in this bill were similar to those later enacted as the Ethnic Heritage Program under P.L. 92-318.